DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 111 092 EA 007 464

AUTHOR Ellena, William J., Comp.; Gable, Martha, Comp.
TITLE Proposals for Progress: Promise and Performance.
INSTITUTION American Association of School Administrators, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 72
NOTE 52p.; A series of 12 articles by selected authors presenting a wide-range of topics of current interest and importance to school administrators
AVAILABLE FROM American Association of School Administrators, 1801 North Moore Street, Arlington, Virginia 22209 (Stock No. 021-00362, $2.00, Quantity discounts)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Role; Educational Accountability; *Educational Administration; *Educational Change; Educational Finance; Elementary Secondary Education; Environmental Education; *Essays; Evaluation Criteria; Performance Contracts; Principals; School Industry Relationship; School Integration; Staff Utilization; Student Rights; Superintendent Role; Teacher Education

ABSTRACT

This publication is a compilation of 12 essays that originally appeared in issues of the American Association of School Administrators' journal, "The School Administrator," beginning in September 1971. Each essay focuses on a different set of educational issues and is intended to provide a thoughtful basis for study and understanding of current problems and issues in public education. The articles include the following essays: "A Sensible Assessment of Student Rights and Responsibilities," by Carl J. Dolce; "Staffing Inner-City Schools," by William Wayson; "School Desegregation: Successes and Unfinished Business," by Truman M. Pierce; "Our Plundered Planet," by James A. Swan; "Ventures in Performance Contracting," by Charles Blaschke; "Client-Centered Evaluation," by George B. Redfern; "The Principalship: Creating and Coping with Change," by William L. Pharis; "Some Thoughts on Accountability," by H. Thomas James; "Organizational Renewal: The Superintendent's Role," by George B. Brain; "The Decade of Reform in Educational Finance," by James A. Kelly; "Schools and Industry Can Be Partners," by Charles Smerin; and "The Revolution in Teacher Education," by Kenneth H. Hansen. (JG)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED111092

Promise & Performance

Proposals for Progress

EA 007 464

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL BY MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
AASA
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER.

A series of 12 articles by selected authors presenting a wide-range of topics of current interest and importance to school administrators.

Compiled and edited by
William J. Ellena, deputy executive secretary,
AASA, Washington, D.C.
and
Martha Gable, editor, *The School Administrator*,
AASA, Washington, D.C.

Published by
American Association of School Administrators
1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Copyright 1972
American Association of School Administrators
All rights reserved. No part of this document may be reproduced in any form without permission in writing from the publisher.

Single copy, $2.00. Quantity orders: 2-8 copies, 10 percent discount; 10 or more copies, 20 percent discount.

Postage charged on billed orders.

Stock Number: 021-00362

A THOUGHT OR TWO

The past few years have been exciting ones—perhaps the most eventful in the history of American education. Schools have been swept into a swirling vortex of cultural change that has made them a more vital part of the culture and more visible on the local, state, and national scenes than ever before.

As education has become more clearly identified with the nation's well-being, the schools have become more visible in the political arena. Perhaps at no other time in our history has education occupied such a prominent place on the agenda of the American people. Our community, state, and national life has brought to the schools new challenges, but it has brought, too, perplexing problems and issues that must be viewed and treated with new perspective.

Increasing amounts of federal funds, the Serrano decision, and other emerging developments are producing profound changes in the historic roles of the local, state, and national governments, and each level of government is attempting to find its unique role in improving American public education. The partnership that has served America so well must now be re-examined in the light of changing conditions.

Sensitive to the growing importance of education, as well as to the persistent and emerging problems and pressures impinging on school administrators, the Executive Committee authorized the preparation of 12 essays, one to appear in each issue of *The School Administrator* beginning in September, 1971. Each essay focuses on a set of critical questions and issues. The series is intended to provide a thoughtful basis for study and understanding of the problems and issues inherent in the changing nature of public education.

We urge each member of AASA to study the essays carefully, to discuss them with his colleagues, his board of education, his congressional representatives, and interested citizens to the end that American public education will become an even more effective institution through which the American people seek to reach their destiny.

PAUL B. SALMON
Executive Secretary
American Association of School
Administrators

Promise & Performance

Proposals for Progress

September 1971
number 1

A Sensible Assessment of Student Rights and Responsibilities

The increasing frequency of litigation concerning student rights is evidence of the widespread disagreement concerning a "proper" definition of student rights and responsibilities. Such disagreement is to be expected whenever society finds itself on the cutting edge of redefinition. It appears that disagreement concerning the issues involved in student rights and responsibilities will become wider and more intense until some new plateau of temporary resolution is reached.

Because the rights and responsibilities of students are a subpart of societal views of the rights and responsibilities of minors, a wider perspective in discussion is necessary. The old convenient labels such as "conservative" and "liberal" are not adequate in explaining differing views. The issues are too complex for such simplistic explanations. Some who are typed as being "conservative" are becoming champions of the individual rights of students. Others typed as "liberals" are expressing views which are supportive of the status quo.

A "sensible" assessment usually means an assessment which is congruent with one's own particular viewpoint. Since the viewpoints held are divergent, it is doubtful that there will be any widespread agreement on what is "sensible." A variety of factors are involved:

1. The particular era in which a definition is formulated
2. The role perspective
3. Values held
4. The anticipated consequences
5. The implicit concepts held concerning the nature of education.

The interaction of these factors as they impinge upon the individual probably determines the resulting point of view.

The following is a brief discussion of each of the factors.

The Era in Which a Definition is Formulated

The particular era in which a definition is formulated is a shorthand way of summarizing society's views of the nature of human beings. It is difficult to explain how societies reach general consensus. It is equally difficult to explain the full measure of significance of this consensus. Nonetheless, over a span of time, it is relatively easy to observe the changing substance of consensus.

Only recently in the history of mankind has there been widespread acceptance of the idea that there are residual rights possessed by human beings, rights which are not externally conferred by the body politic. In more recent history, these rights have been moving through the slow process of extension to all adults, followed closely by extension to students.

Carl J. Dolce, dean, School of Education, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, prepared this article, "A Sensible Assessment of Student Rights and Responsibilities," for *The School Administrator*. **It is the first in a series of twelve essays on the general subject, "Proposals for Progress: Promise and Performance."**

From an era in which children were viewed primarily as chattel, the mainstream of Western civilization moved to an era in which children were viewed as passive entities to be protected from the abuses of society.

As recently as the nineteenth century, children less than ten years of age were employed in subhuman conditions and were worked sixteen hours a day in factories. Only in 1802 was the first law regulating child labor passed in England; this law simply prohibited the employment in factories of pauper children under the age of nine years. It wasn't until 1836 that Massachusetts, the first such state to do so, passed a law regulating child labor. The protection of a passive entity, the child, was clearly the focal point of concern.

Naturally, such a view of children was reflected in the school, which was accorded the widest range of authority over students. During the twentieth century, the view of children as passive entities is slowly being modified. Children are coming to be seen as active entities with certain types of residual rights, many of which are an extension to children of already conceded adult rights.

This change is responsible in large part for the differing opinions concerning the rights of students. Some adults have made this intellectual transition; others have not.

Although there is no method by which to establish definitely the validity of this analysis, it is clear that society has accepted a tolerance limit beyond that expressed in the 1923 decision in the case of *Pugsley vs. Sellmeyer*, in which the actions of school authorities were upheld in denying admission to a student over eighteen years of age who wore talcum powder.

The Role Perspective

Perspectives induced by the role of the individual also influence conclusions reached about rights and responsibilities. Teachers and administrators faced with the difficult problems of student behavior control generally perceive the added difficulties in maintaining such control when the rights of students are extended. Those who do not have the responsibility of limiting student behavior are often completely oblivious to the difficulties involved.

By most evidence available, the the problems of maintaining order in school settings are increasing significantly. A recent Gallup finding indicates an overriding public concern about discipline in the schools. A survey of 110 school districts for the Senate Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency included the following statistics concerning in-school crimes committed:

	1964	*1968*
Robberies	396	1,508
Aggravated Assaults	475	680
Assaults on Teachers	25	1,801
Assaults on Students	1,601	4,267
Narcotics	73	854

Faced with the daily problems of control of behavior and increasing public criticism, school personnel tend to view the establishing and maintaining of order in schools as the first priority. The question of student rights, less pressing, tends to become of secondary importance. Those oblivious to the behavior control problem discount the seriousness or even the existence of such problems.

The Values Held

The priority of values held by the individual perceiver also influences the positions he takes on student rights. To those who value orderliness above individual rights, any extension of such rights at the expense of orderliness is not sensible. To those who view the "establishment" in any of its forms as the enemy, the resolution of the issues concerning student rights is actually tangential to their primary objective: destruction of the status quo.

The Anticipated Consequences

Projections of varying consequences of certain extensions of student rights result in differing viewpoints on whether or not such rights should be extended. There are those who assume that any extension of rights to students necessarily leads to greater problems in behavior control. If one projects that, as a consequence of relaxation of limitations on student dress and appearance, there will result a plethora of behavioral problems, opposition to relaxation of dress codes is understandable. If one is concerned about behavioral problems in schools but projects no negative consequences from a relaxation of dress codes, another type of control strategy might be anticipated.

The Implicit Concepts Held on the Nature of Education

Assumptions about the nature of education also influence the defining of student rights. If education is viewed as primarily a process of indoctrination, then widening of tolerance limits for student dissent is dysfunctional. Richard L. Berkman, in his article "Students in Court: Free Speech and the Functions of School in America," published in the November 1970 issue of the *Harvard Educational Review*, makes a rather convincing case that a changing concept of the purpose of schools underlies the changing views concerning the rights of students.

Assessment of Student Rights

Given the lack of consensus on the five factors discussed, it is inevitable that there should be a resulting lack of consensus on a sensi-

ble assessment of student rights. In an effort to provide one framework for discussion, the following points are offered for consideration:

1. Children and students are more and more viewed as dynamic entities with individual integrities which should be given the widest possible latitudes for development.

2. Extension of rights to students should consider a balance between institutional (societal) needs and individual rights. Rights, even for adults, are not absolute. The rights of an individual should not be allowed to limit similar rights of other individuals. In the absence of clear evidence that extension of rights to individual students will limit the rights of other individuals, or result in the diminishing of the collective good, the rights of the individual student should be extended. The extension of rights of adults in our society has demonstrated its general benefit.

3. Certain types of consequences can be tested, and they should be, as part of a rational discussion of rights.

4. The primary function of schools is to provide proficiency in basic skills, to open alternative thought patterns whereby students may consider probable consequences, and to stimulate a variety of aesthetic and intellectual developments. The primary function of schools is not indoctrination.

These four points have led me to the following conclusions. Students should have the right to express their religious, political, and/or philosophical beliefs. They should have the right of intellectual dissent. Those who oppose such a conclusion do so usually on the basis of one or two premises: (1) the assertion of intellectual dissent and the right to express religious, political and/or philosophical beliefs leads to uncontrolled, disorderly conduct; (2) the major function of the school is to indoctrinate, consequently dissent is dysfunctional.

Judicial guarantee of the rights of students to refuse to salute the flag because of religious, political, or philosophical beliefs has not resulted in widespread disorder. In short, the dire predictions that disorderly student behavior would result from such judicial rulings have not proved accurate. The orderly expression of dissent might, in fact, tend to minimize certain types of disruptive behavior.

The proponents of the indoctrination concept of education assume that they will forever be in control of the levers of power to decide upon the substance of indoctrination. Many of these proponents are militant antagonists to mainland China and the Soviet Union on the basis of the repressive totalitarianism in those countries. To assert that it is only the substance of the indoctrination which is of concern is also to assert a monopoly on truth, a doctrine which is antithetical to a pluralistic society.

Individual students have the right to the widest possible latitude in personal dress and appearance. Some schools have masked their real intention of imposing a set of tastes and standards upon students by predicting negative consequences if certain types of dress were permitted. At times, the arbitrary stand on the part of some school officials reaches obviously indefensible levels as in the case of the second grade girl sent home by the school principal because the girl came to school wearing a pantsuit.

This assertion of rights of students is not to imply an absolute exercise of such rights. As in the case of adults, the rights of individual students must be circumscribed by reasonable limits. The limits are, in part, determined not only by the effects upon the rights of others but also by the effects upon the collective good. Behavior which threatens the welfare of others or which prevents the school from fulfilling its educative functions clearly transcends the limits of tolerance. Examples of such behavior would be occupation of school buildings, noisy demonstrations in schools or classrooms, or actions that prevent free expression of opinion by others.

Under certain circumstances, it can be demonstrated that dress and appearance do threaten the order of the school. In such cases limitations are justified. The courts have tended to uphold actions by school officials circumscribing student rights which, when exercised under certain conditions, will create disorder. An *assertion* of threat of disorder is not sufficient. Neither is a *possible* threat. To admit such bases as a *threat* of disorder or *possible* disorder for the exercise of authority is to permit virtually all types of arbitrary and capricious actions. The "probability of disorder" concept helps to explain what appears at first glance to be a series of contradictory judicial decisions. In certain cases, the right of the school to prohibit the wearing of slogan buttons has been upheld on the grounds of probable disorderly results. In other cases, the courts have denied the right of school authorities to prohibit the wearing of armbands because of the lack of reasonable probability of disorder.

There is one right which is fundamental to all human freedom: the right to due process. To deny due process to anyone is to presume guilt, and thus to deny one of the basic premises upon which our judicial structure is based. Failure of school officials to specify charges and failure to afford a fair hearing may lead to arbitrary, unfair applications of sanctions. This is not to imply that there must be extended-period adversary-type hearing procedures, but rather that in disciplinary action with long-range consequences, the essence of administrative justice must be preserved both procedurally and substantively. As at least one writer has indicated,

it is ironic that many adults fight for the right to a fair hearing in traffic violation cases while at the same time deny this basic right to students whose life chances are significantly lessened by such drastic disciplinary action as long-term suspension or expulsion.

Assessment of Student Responsibilities

Thus far, the discussion has centered upon the *rights* of students. No reference has been made to *responsibilities*. The term "responsibility" in this discussion means the freedom to experience consequences of actions. Shielding individuals from the consequences of their actions places no limits upon the exercise of rights and invites chaos and bedlam. Consequences of actions include both natural results and sanctions by authority.

The necessity of experiencing consequences of actions implies a drastic change in the doctrine of *in loco parentis*, which bequeaths to the school not only responsibility for the welfare of minors but also responsibility for preventing actions which would result in harmful consequences. Universities cannot reasonably be held responsible for the morals of students while being forced to remove restrictions on campus housing. Secondary schools cannot be held responsible for actions of students off campus where closed campus procedures are eliminated.

The failure to shift responsibility (the freedom to experience consequences of action) from schools to the individual is in part responsible for the current state of confusion concerning the issues and for the excesses of behavior which are manifest at times.

When parents and society are unwilling to allow students to experience the full consequences of their actions, the rights of students must be more circumscribed or perhaps be denied completely. To use a simple example, one cannot extend to the pupil the right to run across a busy street at will if one wishes to shield him from the possibility of a fatal injury.

The development and extension of student rights has been largely in response to the various and often happenstance forces which converge at a particular point in time. Indefensible actions by school authorities simply tend to propel judicial decisions and/or public opinion into a more determined effort to protect students from the arbitrary imposition of power. At times, it appears as if the stability of our society is threatened by the failure to link rights with responsibilities more directly. Let us hope that the developing decisions concerning student rights and responsibilities will be based upon a rational framework which extends the rights of students to the widest possible spheres, joined with a basic responsibility for the peaceful and just progression of society.

October 1971
number 2

Staffing Inner-City Schools

Any discussion of staffing schools for the poor—whether urban, suburban or rural poor—has to be a discussion of inaccurately defined problems inadequately met. Despite millions of federal dollars and fewer state dollars, which increased the numbers of staff members in inner-city schools, educational gains have not been demonstrated. Even the numerical gain has been reduced and is threatened still more by severe financial cutbacks brought on by the inflationary costs of the Vietnam war. When personnel are cut back—as they are being cut back in most American cities—mindless policies governing such decisions will be relatively more harmful to inner-city schools than to any others.

Despite tremendous efforts by many sincere educators in the inner city, the total system seems unable to meet educational needs of the poor concentrated there. Even innovative attempts to staff the schools differently are governed by policies and procedures that helped to produce unequal schools in the first place. When the system—preschool through graduate school—is demonstrably failing as it is in the inner city, then a whole range of roles and functions must be revamped before appreciable changes will be noted in the outcomes.

The 1960's introduced many new positions into schools in the inner city. Directors of federal aid, coordinators of projects, guidance counselors, social workers, visiting teachers, reading specialists, teacher aides, volunteers, paraprofessionals —all of these and more appeared on the personnel shopping list. As bodies were found to fill the positions, they appeared at the school to take up the task of reaching what the veterans felt to be unreachable youngsters. Each brought a skill; each engaged in a new range of activities; each introduced new problems for the existing staff. The major benefit—not an unmixed blessing—derived from having more adults around to keep things under control.

Problems of Introducing New Roles

If one were to pinpoint a single problem of introducing new personnel, it would seem to be that we did not recognize that adding positions to an organization is like adding a mother-in-law as a permanent member of a household. No matter how loved, loving, or helpful she is, her integration into a well-developed family structure requires some adaptations. If left to chance, it is most likely that her welcome and her helpfulness will be overshadowed by unanticipated demands upon Mom, Dad and the kids. That is what happened in many schools.

Consequently, facts such as the following have been ignored as the organizations have "just growed."

(1) An organization is a coordinated division of labor. Whether explicit or implicit, someone in the school feels he is, or should be, doing what the added position seems assigned to do. Furthermore, he has to believe he is doing it better or it can't be done.

(2) Few of the people filling new positions have any idea what they are supposed to do. They think someone else knows; everyone else expects them to know.

(3) Many of the requirements for instructing children have been extracted from the teacher's role. Assigning them to a third party doesn't improve instruction.

(4) Most specialists (including administrators) have to change *adult* behavior, but they are chosen

---

William Wayson, director, Urban Education, College of Education, Ohio State University, Columbus, prepared this article, "Staffing Inner-City Schools," for *The School Administrator*. It is the second in a series of 12 essays on the general subject, "Proposals for Progress: Promise and Performance."

on the basis of skill with children and have little training for working with adults.

(5) Every new position is a threat to the teacher's status. Teachers tend to see each new person as a superior. Often pay differentials and job titles reinforce that perception.

(6) Few specialists are taught to recognize or correct some of the most powerful dynamics of the inner-city school and neighborhood.

(7) Status and prestige are not allocated to educators who work with the poor. The reward system and the reward-seeking process exercise great control over who continues to work and with what commitment in the inner city.

Administrators recognize that adding positions, while it may induce a change, generally has little overall effect upon the *usual practices* one sees in a school. When the system changes, old positions take on new characteristics. The superintendent behaves differently, as do teachers and principals. Staffing the inner-city school for more effective education becomes as much a challenge in changing what people do there as in recruiting people to be there. Ultimately, the effort reaches from the neighborhood to the graduate research office—for all who are involved in meeting staffing needs.

Teacher Education

Though some programs are well-known, few teacher education programs even claim to prepare teachers for the inner city. Fewer do. Lacking a conceptual framework within which to fit urban educational problems, faculties in colleges continue to teach values, attitudes and procedures that have contributed to the growth of those problems. The net effect of teacher and administrator training upon the educational system is to maintain inner-city problems, if not to aggravate them.

Changing teacher education is one of the most perplexing issues relevant to staffing inner-city schools.

We fail to see how people learn in our society and to incorporate that knowledge into teacher education. The question often posed is, "Should teachers have special training for the inner city?" Unless one assumes that *different principles* govern how teachers relate effectively with inner-city learners, the answer has to be "no." Other than acquainting teachers with ways of life different from their experience, no special education is necessary. For that matter, acquainting teachers with other ways of life is prerequisite for training them to work with individual children in *any* setting. Yet teacher education has not prepared teachers to do that. So, the inner-city teacher needs a different preparation because every teacher needs a different preparation. The condition is the same for administrators. If the teacher's role is to meet the needs of individual learners, his education must assign higher priority to helping him develop new professional behaviors. Since that has not happened, the present oversupply of certified teachers offers little hope of improving inner-city programs except as it may reduce turnover, thus stabilizing present instruction and permitting selection of more loyal (hence less change-oriented) teachers.

Central Office

Personnel in the central office have great influence on the inner-city school. They make decisions governing school boundaries, student attendance, discipline codes, curriculum, personnel assignment and functions, materials, budgets, and community relations—all of which shape a school program. Standardization and centralization inhibit change in any setting; when they rely deeply upon precedent, authority and tradition, they make change impossible.

Few central office personnel place priority on inner-city problems (except to quell disruptions). Even when personnel in the central office have had experience in inner-city schools, they are not promoted for improving education there. Usually, they "serve their time" without alienating their superiors. Theirs has not been a preparation for using power to improve inner-city schools.

Recognizing these conditions, cities under duress have added positions with titles containing the words "human relations," "community relations," "disadvantaged," or "federal programs." Most of these were responses to some demand for improved education in the inner city, usually for black students who are deemed to be "all alike." Men and women in these positions have had little effect. Many have been appointed for reasons unrelated to the requirements of the job. They have little assigned power and less earned power. The positions are new, and they threaten other positions. Few of the people in them know what they are supposed to do. Decisions are hampered by existing rules and policies. These men would "look bad" if they took effective action to improve curriculum and instruction for the poor. Whatever their activities, success depends at least in part upon changing decisions made by other divisions of the central office. Consequently, most of the men in these positions feel ineffective; some report that they would never have been appointed if they could have become effective.

Principals

However one might like to have it different, the principal is a key man (or woman) for changing schools. At least, he is key in preventing change. Nowhere else can leadership or the lack of it be so evident. No other person seems to have so much effect upon a school.

Yet the developing, recruiting,

selecting and assigning of principals in large systems proceed under a strange combination of patronage and bureaucratic blindness. The process produces impotence and incompetence in the principalship and assures minimum change, particularly in the inner city. Principals generally are selected and trained under the watchful eye of a central office "patron" who strives to place "his" people in schools in return for their allegiance and support in internal struggles. The patron seldom is the superintendent but is in good position to get his people assigned—by virtue of his control over assignments or over key spots in the prevailing career "ladder." He may at a later date depend upon "his" people to support a bid for the superintendency. Primarily, he enjoys the rewards of being "kingmaker" (or -breaker). Given the competition for administrative status and salaries, he is able to select people who are "right-thinkers," according to his own loyalties and values.

After initial assignment, principals are transferred from one school to another according to some hierarchial arrangements that take little account of the nature of the school or of the principal. The progression usually proceeds from small to larger schools and from inner-city (or difficult) schools to more prestigious ones. The only way to enhance one's movement is to get the eye of a patron. The way to fall off the ladder or to retard one's progress is to alienate someone in the central office or to be a part of some embarrassing or annoying controversy. Formal procedures using "objective" criteria have done nothing to change the process; they merely determine the steps through which the aspiring principal must go and they help to screen out those who might change the system. Teacher contract provisions, like internships and examinations, serve to assure loyalty to established procedures.

Once on the job the principal is not enouraged to show initiative or to innovate with accepted outside practices. He is judged less on the quality of education in his building than on the neatness and promptness of his reports (which come in unending duplication from every superior and many secretaries from "the Board"). Oldtimers advise him to refrain from changes, particularly those seemingly encouraged by a new superintendent or upstart assistant. Each attempt to change runs into a deluge of people who want to review it for approval before it can be initiated. Since "no" is the safest answer to give, it is given generously and forcefully, always with blame shifted by the naysayer to some unreachable source such as "the parents" or "the teachers" or "policy." No one can say "go" and no one is responsible for saying "no." The principal is well trained not to go until told he may do so.

Most principals by training or nature feel that they *may* do even less than they *can* do. Their selection and training supports their belief that they are not supposed to tamper with matters beyond their capability and responsibility. Colleagues generally reinforce this belief, rewarding loyalty and punishing change with informal but potent sanctions. If a principal gains support from his staff or community to make changes, he is likely to be transferred to another area before the change can take hold. Consequently, the principal who changes the system stands out as a rare, courageous, and often lonely professional whose hopes for reward lie within his school and community or outside his district. Since the inner-city school is on the lowest rung of the career ladder and on the shortest end of a value system that prizes equal and blind distribution of resources and standardization among procedures, it suffers greatly from staffing practices in the principalship.

Teachers

Teachers generally are selected and assigned by central office personnel. Teachers report several informal pressures (comments during interviews or questions from secretaries, for example) which discourage them from the inner city. Added to family pressures or prejudices carried over from previous learning, such encounters reduce the number of people who will work in the inner city. They also increase the number of the anti–inner-city staff members in other city high schools, the net effect of which is to increase the number of decisions made in both the system and the professional associations which work against better education for the inner city.

The teacher generally arrives at school a brief day or two prior to the opening of school, to be greeted by a principal who did not know whom to expect. In October, after enrollments have settled down, without warning the teacher may get a number of additional children as the board withdraws several teachers to balance class loads in the city. He learns that he has one-tenth or less of the supplies available in a suburban school. Furthermore, he has fewer choices because of centralized purchasing, which also brings delivery sometimes a year or more after the order. *Up the Down Staircase*, which seemed like an exaggerated comedy as a book, now appears to be a manual. Teacher absence is high due to daily stresses. Daily survival takes precedence over improved practices, unless there is a rare combination of insight, initiative, and skill either within the teacher or close at hand in the building. Teachers come to view transfer from the school as a "right," which families and colleagues often pressure them to exercise. Neither money nor administrative rules will persuade them to return.

The teacher gets little help with his problems, other than platitudes or sympathy. He is often prevented from trying new methods. His superiors generally stress discipline and "the rules," though they often can't

defend them. Fellow teachers informally punish deviance from accepted practices. The teacher's own training has convinced him that he should be an obedient servant. Inservice education suffers too much to be discussed in the present article. Suffice it to say that it repeats all of the strengths and weaknesses of university preparation and in most cases is a waste of time and talent. Generally it ignores the same important areas ignored in preservice work. In most cases, principals and teachers leave inservice training to more centralized decision makers, thus abandoning a major resource for changing the program and thus assuring its irrelevance for the inner city.

Federal programs increased the number of personnel in some inner-city schools, but in most there still are fewer professionals per thousand pupils than the average in outlying suburban schools. Other city schoolmen who do not benefit from Title I or other extra funding (and staff) resent the presence of this help in the poor neighborhoods and exert all sorts of pressures to even things up (so long as no one discusses evening up the number of disadvantaged children). Contract provisions and administrative practices are negotiated to the disadvantage of the disadvantaged child and his teachers.

Other Staff

Many of the problems introduced by specialists have been discussed earlier in this article. There isn't space to discuss the importance of custodians and secretaries, though they do much of the instructing in the school. Similarly, if policemen are to be assigned to the school, one must consider their influence on learning.

One important group, paraprofessionals, deserves attention here. This group of new personnel is most inadequately used because of discriminatory interpretation of certification rules. It would be wise to permit school staffs much flexibility in determining the functions of paraprofessionals as they search for more effective roles for all staff members. When teachers engage in selecting, assigning and formulating job descriptions for the paraprofessionals with whom they are to work, they must think seriously about their own activities. Having someone other than teachers make such decisions results in unnecessary conflict, reduced effectiveness, loss of time and poor services to children. Furthermore, it ignores the values to be contributed by paraprofessionals and overstates those claimed for certification.

Daily Substitutes

No other position has been so neglected in all its aspects as that of the daily substitute—the person who comes in when a teacher is absent for a day or so. In inner-city schools, absence rates make substitutions a major staffing problem. Worse, absence introduces instructional problems of critical proportions. Daily subs are unselected or self-selected. They are the victims of much testing behavior from children inclined to such testing. They can seldom work effectively with a class and can practically never instruct one. In schools serving poor children, not only the substitute's class but every class in the vicinity is disrupted. Because substitutes rarely are hired to cover classes in physical education, art and other specialties, all classrooms are affected by those absences. Only an inner-city teacher can understand what happens. If a regular classroom can't be covered (as frequently occurs), nearby teachers usually divide up the students in the class and take them into their rooms. Doing so often upsets a delicate set of dynamics and prevents instruction in all affected groups. Clearly, inner-city schools need to be staffed in ways that will totally eliminate the need for daily substitutes. Though the solutions seem simple, one hears little about anyone adopting them. Probably no single staffing change could have a greater positive effect on daily life in city schools.

The Challenge

No child should be forced to attend schools segregated from other socioeconomic levels of society. Such schools are inherently miseducational. However, neither educators nor politicians intend to eliminate such segregation. Therefore, we must improve conditions within the schools as much as possible.

Many improvements should be apparent from the discussion above. Staffing the inner-city school is not just a problem of attracting workers to a job. What should be a basic exercise in systematic change will continually fall victim to systematized inability to grasp the whole of the problem.

November 1971
number 3

School Desegregation: Successes and Unfinished Business

The shrill cries of newsboys shouting "SUPREME COURT RULES AGAINST SEPARATION OF RACES IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS" reached the second floor room of a hotel where a small group of southern leaders in education were seated around a table discussing ways of improving schools. A stunned silence followed, broken by a voice saying, "What else could be expected? After all, this is but one in a long series of court decisions gradually destroying the foundations of racial segregation."

After considerable discussion, it was concluded that the South would accept the decision as the law of the land and work toward compliance, although most would find the transition undesirable and difficult. This view turned out to represent the early reactions of political, business and industrial leaders across the South. Few dissenting views were expressed at that time.

However, there was an early shift to a harder position led by politicians who, sensing the concerns and fears of people regarding implementation of the decision, tailored their views to what they considered prevailing attitudes, thus abdicating the constructive leadership role they could have exercised. There were occasional leaders who took the opposite view and urged people to abide by the law. The diversity of attitudes and understanding among the people in the region tended to get lost in the stereotype which developed of the South as a region stubbornly, and sometimes with force, resisting the law of the land.

Compliance with the Supreme Court decision became a political issue not to be settled on sound educational grounds. Many political campaigns were waged, even for the highest state and Congressional positions, by candidates who seemed to try to outdo each other in breathing defiance and making promises of "preserving our way of life." This is understandable inasmuch as it might have been political suicide to advocate voluntarily desegregating the schools at the time. As one of the politicians most adroit at making political capital of the issue said, when pressed on what he would do for education if elected, "I have to get elected before I can do anything, and you'll have to let me decide how to get elected." During this crucial period, the lines of resistance continued to harden.

It gradually became clear that voluntary compliance would not be forthcoming. Perhaps it was too much to expect, given the combination of circumstances at the time and the long history of racial separation. The court decision made no provision for compliance; its function was to set forth a principle to serve the purpose of providing a reason for ending dual school systems. There is ample precedent for ignoring such decisions. The Thirteenth, Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments to the Constitution, designed to guarantee citizenship to the slaves freed by the Civil War, were not taken seriously for almost one hundred years. Even in 1954, the year of the decision on school desegregation, the vast majority of Negroes were still disenfranchised.

Use of Force

As it became clear that the initiative for desegregating the schools was not going to be assumed by states or by local school districts, strong national forces began to advocate use of the federal government to force desegregation. Thus, the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was passed, giving the United States Office of Education power to require local school districts to develop and sub-

---

Truman M. Pierce, dean, School of Education, Auburn University, Auburn, Alabama, prepared this article, "School Desegregation: Successes and Unfinished Business," for *The School Administrator*. It is the third in a series of 12 essays on the general subject, "Proposals for Progress: Promise and Performance."

mit for approval plans for desegregating the schools. The Justice Department and the courts became key instruments in school desegregation.

Personnel were employed by the Office of Education to provide "technical assistance" to local school districts in the preparation of desegregation plans. In addition, centers were established in the South, usually under the auspices of universities, to provide assistance with the problems created by school desegregation. Implementation of desegregation plans thus developed and approved was the responsibility of the local districts, although as a rule progress in this area was monitored by the courts.

Thus, the schools designated by the Supreme Court to become agents of social reform unwittingly became pawns in a power struggle between state and national authorities. The fact that the federal government had the power to win did not diminish the intensity of this struggle. Many school districts, feeling that local attitudes would not permit otherwise, waited for the courts to order them to develop desegregation plans. This abdication of leadership, which may have been unavoidable in many districts if they were to survive, resulted in the imposition of court-ordered desegregation plans which were too often unrealistic, impractical, and unacceptable to the community.

Many boards of education and school superintendents were placed in untenable positions. The pressures under which they were forced to function were too much to endure in an objective and rational manner.

Perhaps the most futile exercise of power in enforcing compliance was the withholding of federal funds from school districts that did not meet requirements for desegregation. There is little evidence to show that withholding funds made people feel differently about desegregation or was sufficient "punishment" to bring about voluntary compliance. This is perhaps the best available example of the extent to which Southern beliefs and attitudes were misjudged.

Impact

Most visible in the struggle to desegregate schools were the extremists on both sides of the issue. Examples of violence they precipitated were highly publicized. Some who sought a lawful and orderly transition either became inactive or were forced toward one or the other of the extreme positions. Those who found it difficult or impossible to recognize the changing values, attitudes and beliefs that were emerging became the immovables who recognized the new order only by force as they screamed and raged against the inevitable. On the other hand, starry-eyed reformers seeking a cause left the problems in their own communities and with the fervor of the crusaders of old came into the region to right the wrongs of others. Their actions so infuriated people, many of whom were seeking to do the right thing, that the net effect was to further harden the lines of resistance.

Communities were split into factions which often dissipated constructive efforts into useless strife. Sometimes the schools were blamed for things they were not responsible for. Machinery did not exist to resolve differences of opinion in most school districts, or if it did, it was not used. People of differing views in the community did not generally have the opportunity to help develop constructive programs for orderly transition to unitary school systems.

The divisions within communities and the difficulties in carrying out desegregation plans brought on numerous crises in the public schools. Thousands of white parents refused to send their children to desegregated schools, especially if the percentage of black students was high. Scores of private schools were hastily established, draining many of the teachers from the public schools. The parents of children in the newly formed private schools frequently were local leaders of considerable social and economic stature. This erosion of support for the public schools may well turn out to be one of the signficant costs of desegregation. The white flight from the public schools continues, and no one can foretell when the trend will be reversed. Emergence of private schools designed to perpetuate the dual school system is directly related to the ratio of white and black population in school districts; the higher the black percentage the more likely a white flight from the public schools. This is so pronounced that a few districts are all black at this time.

Probably it should be no surprise that the chief measure of success in school desegregation has come to be how many blacks are in former all-white schools and how many all-black schools are left. Figures here are impressive. According to an Office of Education survey referred to in the July 17, 1971, issue of *Saturday Review*, ". . . the percentage of blacks enrolled in schools with a majority of whites . . ." increased ". . . from 18 percent in the fall of 1968 to 39 percent in the fall of 1970." Furthermore, ". . . the number of black students attending 100 percent black schools dropped from 68 percent to 1968 to 14 percent in 1970, and during the same period the number of blacks enrolled in 80 percent to 100 percent black schools dropped from 74 percent to 39 percent."

The courts have consistently emphasized the numbers game, often without regard to educational feasibility or the security of existing educational programs. Recent Supreme Court decisions further clarify questions concerning the racial ratios of both pupils and faculty members. At this time it appears that these decisions will result in extensive busing of students in order to achieve "racial balance." The established pattern of court resolution of these matters through requiring school

districts to submit plans which are appraised and approved, sometimes with mandated changes by the courts, will be continued, according to present indications.

The role of responsible leaders, black and white, in the desegregation of schools has been underplayed both within and outside the region. These leaders have been handicapped in exercising their influence by extremists who have accentuated divisiveness. There are many examples of courageous leadership by both races in attempting to mount constructive efforts to reach a smooth and orderly transition. The individuals involved in such efforts have sometimes suffered threats and endured retaliations from persons with opposite views.

Even more grossly underplayed has been the attitude of the great middle group of citizens who, struggling to be law-abiding, have in a silent sort of way stood ready to move ahead with the job which obviously had to be done. Time after time when the chips were down this "silent majority" was on the side of lawful desegregation when a viable way was posed. It is to this group that the responsible white and black leaders have been able to appeal. Working unobtrusively and without publicity in many communities this combination has done much to smooth the way of desegregation.

The attitude of a sizeable element of the population is expressed well by the rural board of education member who, talking about a desegregation plan for his county with officials of the Office of Education who apparently assumed him to be a person who would not take action except under force, interrupted the conversation by saying, "Just a minute. Please understand that we are trying to be law-abiding citizens. What we need is your help in doing so." This point of view is far more representative of actual attitudes in the region than the highly publicized examples of harsh and uncompromising resistance sometimes accompanied by violence or the threat of violence.

Despite the pain, bitterness and trauma of forced changes in the historical pattern of racial relationships in the region, better understandings by white and black people of each other have emerged from the turmoil and conflict. At long last the black man has risen above his traditional position at the bottom of a truncated society. Many of the stereotypes the whites have held of the Negro as inherently inferior have been exploded. The placid acceptance by many blacks of the subordinate role in society imposed on them by whites is no longer necessary, and they are breaking out of this severe psychological handicap. Many whites are noting that blacks quickly take advantage of better opportunities for education and self-advancement. Perhaps the greatest surprise of all to many whites is the discovery that blacks given the opportunity often demonstrate the levels of competence which the white man has always admired in himself. Not only has better understanding developed, but in many cases it is complemented by sincere mutual respect.

What appears to be the major goal of forced desegregation has been largely achieved: unitary school systems are the order of the day. Although no satisfactory definition of a unitary school system seems to have been developed, the major requirement is the presence of blacks and whites in the same classroom. This imprecise definition overlooks the fact that mere mixing of races only ends the dual school system; it does not assure equality of educational opportunity. Fundamental educational problems accompanying these changes are yet to be solved in many instances. While the dual school system is gone, real unitary systems remain to be achieved, if by that term we mean schools in which all students are treated alike and in which educational programs are provided that develop the talents, interests and aspirations of each student. We have never had unitary school systems in this sense anywhere in the country.

The desegregation of schools has multiplied the instructional problems that must be faced in providing a satisfactory education for all. For the most part these problems existed before, although in less intense form. Increasing the cultural diversity represented in the typical classroom, which existed before desegregation, creates burdens for teachers which their professional preparation did not equip them to handle.

Many teachers who were successful in the school systems of the past are having extreme difficulty adapting to the professional demands of unitary school systems. A considerable number have left the public schools. The new crops of teachers turned out by teacher preparation institutions are generally inadequately prepared for the challenges of unitary classrooms. Teacher education has tended to remain somewhat aloof from the realities of the profound transitions taking place in the public schools. Recognition of the new and compelling demands on professional competence may well turn out to be one of the best outcomes of the era of school desegregation.

In many school districts massive forced desegregation has been accompanied by a decline in the quality of education, due to the nature of educational problems accompanying the transition and the fact that most school faculties were not prepared to handle these problems successfully. Incidentally, this is the major argument used by those who work to establish private schools. They say it is not possible to have "quality" education in heavily desegregated schools. It is up to the profession to prove this argument false. The early future of unitary school systems in the Deep South may hinge on this point.

One other constructive outcome of the era of school desegregation is increasing recognition that the

problem is not regional but national. Clearly the effects of segregation cannot be categorized acording to whether segregation is *de facto* or *de jure*. The 1954 Court decision, dealing only with biracial school systems, which existed largely in the South, did not give attention to the general problem of racial isolation which in many instances is more serious in the ghettoes of the cities than elsewhere. The bitter resentment of many Southerners over the singling out of the South for forced desegregation while the same problem was ignored in other areas of the country is now being tempered by the beginning assaults on *de facto* segregation.

Unfinished Business

The intent of the 1954 Supreme Court decision was to provide equality of educational opportunity for all children and youth irrespective of race. This goal has not been achieved. The focus of forced desegregation has been on mixing the races in the schools and not on providing equal educational opportunities. There are those who would say mixing had to come first, and, indeed, they may be right. However, mixing as an end in itself, which seems to be the prevailing point of view among enforcers, has detracted severely from the monumental educational tasks that must be attacked successfully if the intent of the Court is to be achieved.

This is not to say that no improvement in educational opportunity has been provided, especially for blacks who in many instances are attending better schools today than formerly. They are being taught in better buildings by better teachers, and they have available more adequate instructional supplies and curriculum materials. Neither is it to overlook the fact that many black and white people have been able to develop better understandings of each other through school desegregation. Rather it is to say that we now have the best opportunity in history to really provide equality of educational opportunity.

Another unfinished task is the improvement of educational quality. Equalization of educational opportunity should not be confused with the improvement of the quality of education. Poor educational opportunity can be equalized. The goal of educational quality should include provision of opportunities for each individual to achieve his best role in society, taking into account his interests and abilities. Ultimately, unitary school systems will provide a better opportunity for achieving this goal at a more economical cost. The combination of equalizing opportunity and improving quality constitute the greatest challenge in history to our educational system.

Whether this gigantic goal will be met rests heavily on how well teachers can be prepared. Many school districts and teacher preparation institutions recognize that traditional teacher education programs are obsolete and that new and creative programs must be developed. This may well be the number one priority in developing the kinds of school systems our society expects and our national goals dictate. There is diminishing tolerance for the inequalities existing in this country. We may be depressed by the violence, harsh confrontation and hardened positions taken by discordant groups and by our ineffective policies for coping with them. But belief in our democratic principles enables us to keep an optimistic outlook. It may be that the courts have assured the exercise of rights and freedoms in various areas of life which our educational systems have not yet prepared people as a whole to exercise intelligently and for the common good. Out of the conflict and violence may yet come a society which somehow has found its way to a true equalization of opportunity. Revolution appears to be the only alternative.

Summary

The last legal hurdle the black man faced in his long struggle for equality of opportunity fell in 1954 when the Supreme Court ended racial separation in the public schools. The decision ushered in a new era marked first by large-scale ignoring of the court order, then by use of the power of the federal government to force desegregation. Strong resistance, often bitter and sometimes violent, followed the use of force.

Democratic processes do not readily provide quick solutions to problems such as those created by school desegregation. It is not our way as a society to carefully think out resolutions for problems and issues in advance and to follow an orderly plan of action accordingly. Rather, we are prone to make decisions on the basis of the pressures of the moment and to permit emerging consideration to dictate our efforts at a given time.

Nevertheless, the dual school system has been brought to an end. Better understandings of each other by blacks and whites have been achieved, accompanied by a substantial increase in mutual respect. Serious educational problems, many of which were not anticipated, have complicated and made extraordinarily difficult the transition to unitary school systems. The emotionally laden climate in which desegregation has taken place has added greatly to the difficulties.

We are now faced with the problem of modifying school programs after the fact of desegregation, without benefit of prior planning in almost all instances other than such immediate planning as was necessary for actual physical transition to unitary school systems. The gigantic educational problems inherent in extending and equalizing educational opportunity and improving the quality of programs available to all challenge the best efforts of school districts in the region and nation if American goals of equal opportunity are to be well served.

December 1971
number 4

Our Plundered Planet

Life exists upon earth due to a complex series of biophysical processes that we are just beginning to understand. Man, unique among animals, has not been satisfied with his natural niche and has, therefore, applied his intellectual capacity to develop methods to overcome certain aspects of natural processes he dislikes. The success of man's ability to conquer natural laws is evidenced in our swelling population and technologically advanced society. While in the short run man receives some benefits from his apparent "successes," in the long run the picture is not so bright.

To support increasing numbers of humans at the same or increased levels of living will require an increasing dependence upon technological innovations to supplement natural biological processes. For example, if the natural assimilative capacity of a river is exceeded and we do not desire pollution, we build a sewage treatment plant to augment natural ecological processes. Such technological development may provide immediate comforts. But the more we turn over our fate to technological processes, the greater chance we risk of suffering ecological disasters if our technology fails. If, for example, we build a giant sewage treatment plant to handle all the sewage from southeastern Michigan, we may begin to improve water quality in Lake Erie, but what would be the result if the plant were destroyed by a tornado? Such a disaster could produce irreparable biological damage.

Most environmental problems do not manifest themselves with the obvious catastrophic effects of a sudden breakdown of a large sewage treatment plant. Instead, most environmental pollution is perceptually unobtrusive, gradually worsening over time until a crisis, by then often irreversible, occurs. People often adapt psychologically to certain forms of pollution. For example, my own research with high school students in Detroit clearly shows that youth who seldom leave Detroit's hazy skies eventually come to accept grayish-brown as a normal sky color.

Unfortunately, people do not *physiologically* adapt to polluted air as easily. Recently we surveyed 610 residents of three Detroit suburbs that are subjected to very high levels of air pollution and found an alarming number of health problems that could be associated with air pollution. For example, 17 percent of the population was reported suffering from bronchitis during the last year. The national average is 2 percent. If one grows up with increased frequencies of respiratory disorders, it is unlikely that he will relate them to air quality. Rather, he will come to accept them as normal, when they need not be.

Citizens have the right to know the effects of our technologically advanced society upon their lives and upon the environment. My feeling is that as we conduct more environmental research we will find that DDT and mercury are only the beginning of a long list of environmental contaminants that are harming us. Looking into a crystal ball a little, I predict that the next round of horror stories will deal with arsenic, asbestos, selenium, cadmium and a number of pesticides.

As educators we cannot expect to be leaders in environmental research, yet through application of existing research techniques we can contribute a great deal of our knowledge to the severity of existing environmental problems. I would propose that every science teacher in

---

James A. Swan, assistant professor in environmental education, School of Natural Resources, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, prepared this article, "Our Plundered Planet," for *The School Administrator*. It is the fourth in a series of 12 essays on the general subject "Proposals for Progress: Promise and Performance."

this country has the capacity to help his students define the severity of local pollution problems. Not only can the students conduct some very basic ecological experiments such as measuring dissolved oxygen levels in a stream or dustfalls in the school yards, but the results of their work can be made even more meaningful if they use more practical monitoring approaches. For example, why not place several species of fish into samples of water and determine which species, if any, are affected adversely by the water quality? Why not monitor air by placing a series of pollution-sensitive plants around the community and studying any changes in growth patterns? Why not place specimens of fabrics, rubber and metals around the community and compare rates of deterioration?

Today there are a number of books on the market that describe some fairly sophisticated environmental monitoring experiments. One criticism of those I have seen, however, is that they never tell students how significant their results are. If you know that your air contains an annual average of 90 micrograms per cubic meter of suspended particulate matter, that doesn't mean very much if you don't know that annual averages of that level will increase your likelihood of contracting chronic bronchitis.

As we gain a greater understanding of the extent of the ecological, physiological and economic damage we are suffering, some of us will become increasingly concerned. I want to stress the word *some*, for not everyone places equal importance on knowledge of the relationship between pollution and human health. To some, pollution is the price of progress. Recognizing that damage to oneself will result from certain behavior does not always lead to a cessation of that behavior. (Consider the large number of people who continue to smoke cigarettes, despite the convincing evidence that smoking causes serious health problems.)

Initially we have seen widespread popularity for the "ecology movement," which has produced some important short-run improvements, such as the defeat of the SST. After a few such victories, however, I feel that preservation and enhancement of environmental quality will not have such resounding support. Many engineers are being laid off by reduced expenditures for space programs and the Congressional defeat of the SST. These people, and many others, will not be enthusiastic about environmental quality. The absence of blacks and other minority groups from the ecology movement indicates the differing priorities of minorities. If someone has been denied access to economic and material wealth all his life and is just beginning to see that he might get some, he's not going to be very receptive to cries for decreasing levels of consumption, or closing down plants that don't comply with pollution control orders. One of the biggest difficulties with the present "ecology movement" is that its followers seldom stop to consider why certain people might oppose anti-pollution programs for rather good reasons.

I cannot overemphasize the importance of human values to this discussion. The environmental crisis is not an accident. It is the product of a complex series of human decisions which are ultimately based upon consideration and evaluation of information, the importance of which is determined by our values. In the short run we will make some gains in environmental quality from technological solutions like tertiary sewage treatment and placing catalytic converters on automobile exhaust systems. In the long run, however, such gains will be offset by population growth, increasing levels of consumption of resources and energy, and the general technological explosion, unless all of these trends are reversed. This reversal will require a radical change in our present social system and its underlying social values.

For a moment, let us look at our social values more closely. Reviewing research on the American culture, Williams identifies our present major social values as—

1. A central stress on personal achievement, especially secular occupational achievement. The success of this achievement tends to be measured in economic and material terms.
2. A desire to dominate the world of nature, to subdue and exploit the surrounding world.
3. An emphasis on the merit of work for work's sake alone.
4. The presence of a strong concern for a strict moral code, which has been termed "moral overstrain."
5. A strong emphasis upon efficiency and proficiency.
6. Compartmentalized humanitarianism—giving to various charities, as opposed to generalized giving.
7. A reverence for progress.
8. A preoccupation with material comfort, especially with those things that provide effortless gratification. Williams observes, "In so far as a group or society is able to attain a high plane of material comfort, it will tend increasingly to emphasize 'hedonistic values' unless checked by *internal social danger or outside threat*." (Italics are mine.)
9. Avowed equality.
10. Verbal proclamation of freedom.
11. External conformity (faddishness).
12. Great faith in the power of science and secular rationality.
13. Strong nationalistic sentiments.
14. Strong concern for individualism and an aversion to the invasion of an individual's integrity.
15. Prevalence of culturally sanctioned attention to something called democracy.
16. The ascription of value and privilege to individuals on the basis of race or particular group membership.

Examining these values should give us some insight into why we are in the present mess. Rather than seeking satisfaction through spiritual and human channels we seem preoccupied with economic and material gratification, which generates voluminous quantities of waste and requires large volumes of resources. We proclaim certain principles like freedom, equality and democracy, yet in real life pay more attention to personal gratification than concern for society and other living things. This set of values produces acts like littering and industrial air pollution. In some cases, we even purposely discriminate against others. The worst pollution generally occurs where the poorest people with the least political power live. In such cases, pollution is an act of social discrimination.

The thesis I offer to you, therefore, is that at the very heart of the environmental crisis are the social values that have affected our current society. If we want to resolve pollution, we will have to change social values and, undoubtedly, the institutions that reflect them.

At the risk of sounding like a prophet, I would like to propose some new social values to replace some of our old ones.

I feel that we need to increase our reverence for life so that individuals will behave in a manner consistent with the preservation of diversified communities of living things. Our lack of concern for other living things and their roles in ecological cycles has led us into many of the ecological problems we face today. Western farmers are troubled by prairie dogs, so some of them spread 1080 (sodium trifluoroacetate) and kill many living things in addition to prairie dogs. Why are prairie dogs abundant? Because we have killed off many of their natural predators, such as the coyote. We know that the most stable ecological communities are generally those with the greatest species diversity. If we valued diversity more, we would be more tolerant of dandelions, coyotes and crabgrass, and would suffer much less pollution.

We are a society that reveres the past, lives in the present and fears the future. We must reverse this trend and develop citizens who are more considerate of the future results of present actions. This means we must develop patience and tolerance for uncertainty, rather than continue to maximize present personal gains at the expense of the future.

Many of our environmental problems exist because no one has ever seriously wanted to do something about them. Rather than provoke controversy, we have developed tolerance for injustices so that we might minimize personal sacrifice. The resolution of our environmental crisis is going to require the collective effort of most Americans. We must develop a strong sense of obligation to participate in collectively solving the problems of society if we ever hope to survive in the long run.

Finally, we must develop a reverence for the ecological processes that support life. This means that if we choose to develop an area, development should proceed according to the natural life support systems of the environment, as Ian McHarg has proposed. In some cases we may find it necessary to develop technological procedures for assisting natural processes, such as developing sewage treatment plants and recycling garbage. Such technology should, however, be designed to supplement nature, not to dominate it.

This list is not meant to be all-inclusive, but rather to stimulate you to expand upon it, alter it, and develop your own recipe for survival. Simple intellectual discussion of values, however, will mean very little unless these values are internalized and expressed in behavior. This will not be an easy task. Our school systems offer an opportunity for development of new social values, but their present structure and function are such that they are not likely places for changing values. The traditional model of education in our public schools was developed back in the days when the principal functions of schools were to convey information and develop discipline. Youth today are rejecting these educational techniques as not in keeping with social needs. If environmental education is ever going to be successful in resolving environmental problems, it must address itself to them in a relevant manner. It must also delve much more deeply into the processes of human motivation, behavior and attitude formation and change. Conveying factual information is important, but only after the learners can see its worth. This calls for a series of approaches to education different from what currently predominates in our public schools.

Many environmental problems evolve over long periods of time from many seemingly innocuous individual actions. It is often extremely difficult, therefore, for the average person to see how he personally relates to an environmental problem. For example, recent research has shown that while many people will agree that there is a population problem, few recognize its relationship to personal family size. Traditional classroom teaching techniques are not appropriate for dealing with such abstract concepts. More appropriate are such techniques as games and simulations which allow condensation of both time and space. The role-playing involved in many games further helps to develop personal appreciation for the feelings of others. For example, when white middle-class children play the role of black inner-city residents in gaming simulations dealing with planning, they frequently report feelings of frustration and anger when they see their powerlessness.

I would further advocate the implementation of classroom tech-

niques for developing trust and respect for others. Games and simulations will help here too, but I feel we must explore techniques such as are sometimes used in human relations work. I am not saying that every fifth grader should undergo sensitivity training, but rather that many of the exercises used to develop trust as a basis for human relations work might be used as part of environmental education. For example, children might be given more situations that require group effort for successful results.

We must also strive to develop citizens who recognize their interdependence with others and feel some social responsibility to others. One result of our affluent, mobile society is that the people with the greatest political, social and economic capacity to improve society now more than ever before can most easily escape from its problems. The national cult of escapism not only represents a drain on environmental problem solving but is also rapidly leading to the destruction of many of the remaining natural areas of this country. One need only note the traffic jams in Rocky Mountain National Park, the piles of litter along back roads in the Everglades, or the polluted trout stream that runs through Aspen, Colorado, to see this happening.

I think one way we might begin to cope with the problem of escapism would be to develop exchange programs where students would have an opportunity to live outside of their home communities for a year or so and gain an appreciation for the lives of others. Traditionally, outdoor education programs have taken children from the city to see the country and then taken them back to their polluted worlds, perhaps leaving them frustrated that they don't have the money to return to clean air and water very often. I think we might also design urban resident experiences for rural and suburban children so they can gain an appreciation for the lives of urbanites and recognize some basic human interdependencies.

We must also work very hard to develop a sense of efficacy for coping with environmental problems. We can make people aware of environmental problems and their dire consequences, but we cannot motivate them to resolution of the problems unless they feel they can play an important role. Games and simulations can help here too, but only to a point because they are not the real world. I strongly feel that a logical outgrowth of any environmental education program is the actual resolution of community problems. This is what relevance is all about.

Let me give one example of relevant problem solving. In a Michigan inner-city high school a biology teacher wanted to have her class study pest control. Looking for examples of pest problems nearby, they discovered cockroaches in the school. She then posed a problem: how to control them. Students explored alternatives—chemical control and biological control. They experimented with ways of limiting appropriate food, water and shelter for cockroaches. In the long run, they found, these means of biological control were more effective, safer and cheaper than using chemicals. This was a relevant learning experience that also helped solve a community problem.

In choosing problems for such study it is important to identify ones that students can have some immediate impact upon, such as cockroach control, litter pick-ups or glass recycling. A teacher who focuses only upon massive problems such as regional air pollution, where the individual citizen has little impact, risks building up only a sense of "well-informed futility" in his students.

If youth can first become involved in resolving local problems, they will tend to develop a sense of personal efficacy which will lead them to become involved in larger community problems.

Research on political socialization has clearly shown that schools do have a profound influence on children's attitudes. Environmental education should recognize this influence and design programs purposely aimed at facilitating the formation of attitudes and values. Notice I said *formation* of attitudes and values, not dictation of what attitudes and values should be held. Too often our schools give only one side of the issue. Environmental education should attempt to provide students with all sides of an issue and the consequences of each alternative. This will greatly enhance value clarification as well as encouraging students to think seriously about the future. Both of these goals are basic to successful environmental education programs.

Our schools offer one opportunity for working toward the development of a society that will be more aware of its impact upon the environment and less prone to sit idly by in the face of environmental deterioration. As the old adage goes, "An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure." Hopefully, educators, recognizing their roles in resolving the environmental crisis, will soon begin to implement programs to accomplish the goal of successful environmental education.

References

Barnett, Larry D. (1970), "U.S. Population Growth as an Abstractly Perceived Problem," *Demography*, Vol. 7, Feb. 1970.

McHarg, Ian (1969), *Design with Nature*, Natural History Press.

Toffler, Alvin (1970), *Future Shock*, Random House.

Williams, Robin M. (1963), *American Society: A Sociological Interpretation*, Alfred Knopf.

January 1972
number 5

Ventures in Performance Contracting

Performance contracting has been hailed as the "hottest thing in education" by the news media, "hucksterism" and a "conspiracy" by critics, and a "panacea" by zealots. Neither critics nor overzealous advocates have done justice to this managerial innovation, limited technically and by the intentions of man himself. This article will attempt to summarize the foundations of the concept, the variations in application, the results presently available and a few thoughts on the future.

The Approach. The performance contract-turnkey approach is a managerial tool designed to ensure that results are achieved in a way that encourages responsible innovation. A school district enters into a contract with an outside firm or an internal teachers' group to accelerate achievement of a limited number of underachieving students, with reimbursement to the contractor based on students' performance as measured by achievement or performance-based tests. After a period of successful demonstration, the school then adopts or expands the contractor's instructional program on a "turnkey"* basis, making the necessary changes in order to realize the program's potential.

School districts initiate a performance contract-turnkey project for one or all of the following reasons:

1. To provide a supplemental capability that would be too costly to develop internally (e.g., vocational training)
2. To test, analyze and validate newly developed instructional systems before adoption on a wide-scale basis
3. To assist in solving political, social and economic problems confronting school administrators.

The heart of the performance contract-turnkey approach is the "performance specification," usually stated in a Request for Proposal (RFP), which is sent to prospective bidders or teacher faculties. It also includes particular dollar and other constraints. Based upon the RFP, the contractor's proposed response, and face-to-face negotiations, a final contract evolves.

The concept's "lifeblood" is the turnkey phase. After seven to nine months of operation, a turnkey analysis is conducted, usually by a Management Support Group, to determine—

- The relative cost-effectiveness of the contractor's and school's existing program.
- The economics of the contractor's instructional program.
- The nature and extent of changes that have to be initiated by the school to achieve the results demonstrated by the contractor.

For example, the contractor might guarantee that the school will achieve 90 percent of the 1.5 grade level gain which he demonstrated could be achieved by using differtiated staffing, incentive pay and classroom management techniques, if administrators would incorporate such changes into the "turnkey" classrooms. A lesser guarantee would be without such changes. Alternative levels of costs and benefits available during the turnkey phase provide a unique leverage for change. Viewed as a means and not as an end in itself, the local school systems can experiment at low risk, demonstrate and test a

* Similar to the housing field where a private contractor builds a facility under contract to the local housing authority and then "turns the key" over to the resident when the housing authority determines that all specifications have been met.

Charles Blaschke, president, Education Turnkey Systems, Inc., Washington, D.C., prepared this article, "Ventures in Performance Contracting," for *The School Administrator*. It is the fifth in a series of essays on the general subject, "Proposals for Progress: Promise and Performance."

program in a local environment, and then adopt it, ensuring the realization of its potential.

Variations in Performance Contracting over Last Two Years. Rationale: School systems and federal agencies have used performance contracting as a low-risk, low-cost means of experimentation with various kinds of instructional systems. The cost risks are minimized—no results, no pay. Recognizing the political problems of experimentation, the political risks of failure are also minimized. If the instructional program is not successful, then the contractor "failed," not the school. OEO used performance contracting as a technique for conducting a $7.5 million-plus nationwide experiment in over 20 schools during the last school year; other agencies are considering it.

A few school districts have viewed performance contracting as a long-run appendage. Dallas officials applied it to vocational training last year, and this year intend to utilize contractors to operate an entire vocational training institute. Gary officials contracted with BRL to provide services for a four-year period.

A larger number of school districts are utilizing performance contracting to solve political, social and economic problems confronting them. Texarkana and Savannah and several other school districts have used performance contracting as an educationally effective yet politically acceptable means for racial integration. In other instances, where the community school concept is highly supported, school districts have proposed to utilize performance contracting as a means to ensure "equity of results" (e.g., the Dallas "desegregation by TV" plan). Several school districts have viewed it as a means to rationalize the collective bargaining process by establishing precedents for "pay-based-upon-productivity," differentiated staffing, and teacher accountability. In districts with aggressive teachers, it has been used to delegate decision-making authority while holding the teacher accountable for results. Performance contracting also provides the opportunity for community and parental involvement in planning and operating projects, since many contractors utilize locally trained community aides (e.g., the first major decision of the decentralized, community-controlled district #9 in the Bronx).

Subject Areas. Performance contracting is limited to those instructional areas where objectives can be clearly defined and criteria for measurement mutually agreed upon. As a result, over 90 percent of the projects are directed toward math and reading for underachieving, educationally deficient target populations at both elementary and secondary levels. Vocational training contract projects range from auto mechanics to drafting, and one project used performance contracting to increase "creative thinking" as measured by IQ tests. In Grand Rapids, Michigan, it is being applied with educable mentally retarded children. And several firms as well as other groups have proposed to use performance contracting in providing instruction in music, band, social studies, and art.

Types of Contractors. The majority of the projects have been operated by private corporations, some of which have utilized teaching staff already on the payroll of the school district. Most of the firms are experienced in programed instruction, the use of teaching machines and contingency management techniques, and are small to medium-sized systems management groups which utilize the material and equipment available from manufacturers. Performance contracting has not attracted the large educational firms because they are reluctant to reduce their markups to become competitive.

The instructional systems used range from the more traditional program to those involving sophisticated teaching machines, computers for instructional management (e.g., prescription and diagnosis), and high student/teacher ratios (one contractor used one professional and 32 paraprofessionals to instruct 600 students in math and reading). While some firms use material rewards, others rely more heavily on intrinsic motivation to increase the performance of the students. Despite the seemingly large variances in instructional systems design, several common threads appear:

- Individually prescribed, self-paced instructional programs
- Proven classroom management techniques
- Paraprofessionals and differentiated staffing
- Programed software combined with A-V media
- Incentives for teachers and students.

In 80 to 90 percent of the projects last year, the firms "guaranteed" a minimum grade level increase per child or no payment would be made (e.g., 1.0 in the OEO experiment). In most instances, incentives were provided for incremental gains above the minimum level; in others, prorated penalties were imposed below a specified level. The contracted fee for raising a student one grade level per subject ranged between $45 and $70 (teachers remain on school payroll) and from $81 to approximately $220 (contractor hired teachers).

During the last school year at least two *teachers' associations* contracted with local boards, whereby teachers could collectively earn several thousand dollars. Several projects to be implemented this year will provide incentives for *individual teachers* and even *parents* based upon student performance. In a USOE-sponsored project in four sites, teachers could earn up to $1,200 per class and parents $100

per child. In Dade County, Florida, teachers can earn as much as $110 per student for 100 percent gains above expected levels; moreover, teachers will also be provided $55 per student to defray operating costs and will have the option of using the $55 as risk capital to invest in the classroom, with the contingency that if a student's performance is less than 50 percent above the expected gain, all $55 has to be returned.

Results Thus Far and What We Learned: Observations. With achievement results from many projects still unavailable (e.g., the results in 20 sites in the OEO experiment), most "report cards" to date include cost-effectiveness. Preliminary results from scattered projects indicate that the average rates of achievement in math and reading for underachieving students were about doubled for a cost slightly more than existing cost per student year per subject. The results (ranging from .4 to 1.7 grade level gains) reported in the recent Rand Corporation study, limited to five districts, did not take into account the *actual* number of hours of instruction provided by contractors.

Cost of OEO Experiment. The costs of over 40 contract programs analyzed by Education Turnkey Staff are rather revealing.

First, while many firms used similar materials, the economics of the systems varied significantly. In the control schools, for example, about 70-75 percent of total costs were spent on teacher pay, and about 1-2 percent on books and A-V materials respectively; the contractors spent 55-65 percent and 15-20 percent in these areas.

Second, if schools adopted contractors' instructional programs, operating costs would be less than existing school costs per student per subject in about one-third of the cases and somewhat greater in the rest.

Third, achievement scores in contractors' programs would not have to be much greater than control program scores for contractors' programs to be more cost-effective than the schools.

The reasons for variances and lower-than-expected costs noted in the Turnkey report to OEO included—

- Better student scheduling and utilization of facilities.
- Use of aides to operate self-paced, individualized student learning systems.
- Reliance on instructional components with relatively low operating costs.
- Better management control, yet greater flexibility.

Aside from the relatively high start-up costs, however, a primary consideration for interested administrators must be the public's present attitude.

The Gallup Survey of Public Attitudes Toward Public Schools disclosed that the number one problem is "finances"—where should costs be cut when local boards are *forced* to reduce total budgets? The general public does not want to increase class size (79 percent oppose) or cut teachers' salaries (77 percent oppose) but *does* want to reduce the number of administrators (50 percent favor) and the number of counselors (32 percent favor) and have schools charge rent on all textbooks (34 percent favor), for example. The general public is either emphatically certain about what contributes most to student achievement, or is totally ignorant about the economics of school operations and performance contracting. Our analysis of the typical school using the trade-off capabilities indicated—

- That to save an equal amount of money by increasing student-administrator ratio, as opposed to increasing student-teacher ratio, one would have to increase the former from 406:1 to 564:1, while the latter from 29:1 to only 29.7:1.
- That the savings accrued through renting books rather than providing them free of charge could be surpassed by increasing class size by one-half student or by reducing the average annual pay of teachers by less than 1 percent of the total budget.
- That a decrease in annual pay of teachers by 3 percent *or* a 30 percent decrease in classroom maintenance will pay for a 100 percent increase in books and audiovisual materials.

Analyses of these and many other equal-cost trade-offs in performance contractors' programs indicate cost-saving potential in certain program areas (e.g., math and reading). In the same Gallup survey 49 percent of the public favored performance contracting. The public's attitude toward the cost saving could constrain the effective adoption of performance contract learning systems during the turnkey phase. If the results are significant, then perhaps public perceptions will change as educational myths and concepts are displaced, and school administrators will be freer to manage. (See "Performance Contracting Costs, Management Reform and J. Q. Citizen," *Phi Delta Kappan*, December, 1971.)

Inexpensive and Low-Risk Experimentation. Because many of the firms were overly ambitious or optimistic about grade-level guarantees, the actual fee paid by the school system in many cases was small relative to the increases in student performance. One district, for example, paid a fee less than existing school costs for a doubling of the rate of learning by the firm (more profitable for the school than for the firm). Schools also avoided risk: in most instances, the political "heat" resulting from the experimentation was directed not toward the school but toward federal sponsoring agents or toward the firms.

The Virginia Department of Education in its report on its project

in seven districts noted: "As experienced here, performance contracting, as a means for low-risk, low-cost experimentation in education innovation can be considered successful."

Increased Innovation. Designed to encourage responsible innovation, performance contracting's significant contribution was the actual design and application of "total learning systems." In this respect, it did allow the flexibility for firms to "systems engineer" a variety of methodologies and curricula tailored for the target populations. As the Rand study noted, "It really does facilitate radical change."

With the exception of the first Texarkana project, whose "test teaching" allegations have since been somewhat disclaimed, and a limited number of others, few radically innovative hardware or software developments have surfaced. Perhaps the lack of developmental funds and the relatively short life of performance contracting have been significant factors, or perhaps the realization is dawning that classroom instructional management might be more significant than "gadgetry" in producing results!

A Catalyst for Reform. With achievement scores not yet available to many districts, about a third have continued contract projects this year, another third plan to adopt the contractor's program in part or totally on a turnkey basis, and the rest are undecided. One Virginia site expanded the turnkey phase from two schools last year to ten this year; all three projects in Grand Rapids have been turnkeyed. A turnkey operation at the entire elementary level is planned in Taft, Texas. For turnkey projects to be operated as effectively or efficiently as last year's performance contract projects will require school administrators' willingness to initiate radical management changes.

Short- and Long-Term Future of Performance Contracting. In the immediate future, performance contracting with private firms will remain controversial. In the long run, in its initial form, it might have put itself out of business not because of its failure but because of its success.

If successful, performance contracting will probably become a political "whipping boy" during this election year. Senate democrats have already made known their feelings toward this "administration program." The NEA and the AFT will continue to oppose performance contracting with private corporations. Already tense relationships between NEA and the AASA will be even further strained, as indicated by the policy positions of the AASA regarding performance contracting.

During the next school year it is highly probable that a few lawsuits will involve performance contracts, especially those with private corporations over delegation of authority, collective bargaining agreements, etc. On the other hand, certain teacher groups will be pressuring administrators for performance contracts not only to allow for professional self-governance, but also to establish precedents for collective bargaining.

Number of Performance Contract Projects Will Increase in 71-72. The number of performance contract-turnkey projects will expand over last year. Contracts with private corporations will be fewer but more costly than they were last year. Many will press administrators to adopt their "proven" programs on a turnkey basis without going through the performance contract phase. Funds available from local and state channels will increase. For example, the Michigan Department of Education is funding $23 million worth of performance "contracts" with 67 school districts and a lesser amount with private corporations under recently passed "compensatory education" legislation.

A major trend becoming readily apparent is *incentive contracting* between local boards of education and teachers' faculties or individual schools. Teachers will demand the same degree of freedom and program flexibility the performance contractors have had. Incentive contracts with teachers already exist in over 10 school districts, and many more can be anticipated during the next few months.

In the long run, to the extent that performance contracting results (not solely achievement gains) are favorable, performance contracting should put itself out of business as school districts internalize contractors' programs through the turnkey operations and simulations of alternative contractors' programs. However, to the extent that private and public groups continue to develop new learning systems that offer promise, performance contracting with firms will be utilized as a low-cost, low-risk vehicle for experimentation. To the extent that "hybrid" performance or incentive contracts are negotiated between school boards and teachers' groups, risk capital allocations will be provided increasingly to school teachers who are willing to risk investing in themselves or the classroom to ensure the greatest educational return for the dollar expended.

Closing Comment. Performance contracting and turnkey operations are now realities in public education. As concepts are applied, bastardization occurs, if not in the conjugal bed, at least during the toddler stage. The result is sometimes unrecognizable. The barriers to performance contracting in public education have been significant.

Moving from promise to performance has not been an easy task. Only in education could the term performance contract have emerged. And never in the course of public education have so few with so little done so much to threaten—unjustifiably, I feel—so many.

February 1972
number 6

Client-Centered Evaluation

Nous vous demandons! We demand—catchword of an era of protest—was increasingly heard by school administrators during the decade of the sixties. Demands from the public, from students, and from teachers changed and will continue to change the shape of the school administrator's job. As in the case of all chief executives' roles, the school administrator is obliged to assume the responsibility for responding to and using the forces of change constructively, insightfully and open-mindedly. Otherwise, he will be a leader in name only. Perhaps the greatest demand goes unvoiced: "Be our leader. Identify and initiate the action that needs to be taken."

School administrators and educators generally have a new, or at least a more visible and vocal, clientele to answer to. Of necessity, they have to answer in new ways. The notion of new clientele and new responses is embodied in the concept of accountability. "Accountability" has become a catchword to epitomize what is hoped will be an era of leadership's constructive response to "demand." It signifies that the school administrator must listen and respond to different, and often dissident, drumbeats.

School administrators are now seeking ways to put the accountability concept into practice. Along with other efforts, they would do well to turn their attention to "client-centered evaluation," an incipient change in the evaluation of professional school personnel at all levels. The term has various meanings, but generally refers to any situation in which school personnel are evaluated by subordinates in addition to superiors. In a way, client-centered evaluation is exactly what the beating on the superintendent's door that began in the sixties is all about.

Who can be evaluated by clients? The answer is everybody who has clients. Teachers can be evaluated by students, principals by teachers and students, central office administrators by principals and others below them in the line of authority, and the superintendent by his management team. Parents and other members of the community the schools serve may also be involved in the evaluation process.

Characteristics of Effective Response to Forces of Change

Client-centered evaluation has potential for being a sound adaptation to some of the forces pressing to change the schools. It can fulfill two requirements for an effective administrator response in general. First, an administrative response must be genuine and satisfy the psychological needs being expressed in the drive for change. Second, in responding affirmatively to demands, the administrator must be reasonably sure that the change will improve—not weaken—the education process. In other words, the response to immediate demands from clients should not be so ill-conceived as to subvert the ultimate requirement that the clients themselves place upon the educational system, i.e., improving education. How well a response succeeds in both satisfying the clients' needs and improving education depends in part on another, more crucial, criterion: how well it can be integrated and coordinated with existing programs in the school system and those under development. The more systematic and less piecemeal the administrator's responses, the better the chances for success.

Client-Centered Evaluation as an Effective Response

The need to which client-centered evaluation responds is by now

---

George B. Redfern, associate secretary, American Association of School Administrators, Washington, D.C., prepared this article, "Client-Centered Evaluation," for *The School Administrator*. It is the sixth in a series of twelve essays on the general subject, "Proposals for Progress: Promise and Performance."

familiar. It is people's need for more involvement in controlling matters that affect their daily lives. Over the past decade, the need has emerged as a strong force directed toward large institutions, particularly government, business, churches and the schools. This force is likely to persist and to exert an increasingly pervasive influence upon society's major institutions. The need for many forms of participation has been expressed variously as a desire for shared responsibility, collaborative decision making, an end to paternalism, and restoration of the role of public agencies as servants rather than masters of the people. That this need has sometimes been expressed stridently, coercively and violently should not be interpreted to mean that it is only a loud and passing cry from very small noisy groups.

School administrators have been challenged by expressions of the need for participation by three groups: students, community and teachers. Teachers' demands for collective bargaining put them in the vanguard, but pressure for more meaningful student involvement, community control and decentralization have not been far behind. Today there is an incipient challenge from certain groups of administrators themselves for some form of organized, formalized contract negotiations.

The merit of client-centered evaluation is that it affords those who are served and led by professional school personnel a channel for direct, concrete participation in an administrative function that is vital to increasing the schools' productivity—evaluation. But the potential for client satisfaction will go unrealized, and frustration will be intensified, should these evaluations fail to exert an identifiable influence on the overall evaluation of the personnel in question. The criterion of genuineness must be met.

Clients should be informed as to how their evaluations will contribute to the overall evaluation program, and this program should become more output-oriented, thus creating a direct line from client evaluation to educational output. For example, when teachers identify strengths and weaknesses in the performance of their principal from their perspective, he is better able to amplify his strengths and overcome his deficiencies. A hoped-for fallout of this teacher-principal interaction through evaluation is that teachers will see the results of their assessment contributions in the improvement of the principal's performance.

Integrating Client-Centered Evaluation with the Overall Evaluation Program

Evaluation by performance objectives is perhaps the type of evaluation best suited to the era of accountability because it is output-oriented. It is a continuous, goal-directed *process* of improving the product (performance), rather than rating traits or characteristics.

Client-centered evaluation can enhance the effectiveness and usefulness of evaluation by performance objectives and, therefore, should be welcomed by school administrators for its intrinsic value. It can help them do a better job, as well as satisfy their clients' need for a sense of participation.

Data from client-centered evaluations should be used to assist the evaluator and evaluatee in developing performance objectives and assessing how well they have been met. These data should not be the sole basis for deciding and later for judging, but they can give an invaluable insight into how those the evaluatee is serving perceive his performance.

The clarity of data from client-centered evaluation can be enhanced and their proper weight ensured if the evaluation inputs from each client group relate to performance areas in which the evaluatee interacts substantially with that group. A model for evaluation of a principal might be as follows:

1. Teachers furnish *general* evaluations of the principal on the basis of teacher-principal interactions and relationships.
2. Pupils furnish *general* evaluations of the principal in those areas where they come into direct contact with him.
3. Parents and patrons furnish *general* assessments restricted to those items of parent-patron-principal relationships about which they have direct knowledge and experience.
4. Administrative superiors focus upon performance objectives which they and the principal have cooperatively formulated and which are designed to move the principal ahead in his performance.

Administrative superiors concentrate upon the evaluation of the principal's performance in terms of the performance objectives they have cooperatively determined with him, for this is the area of their direct experience with him. His clients, whose interactions with him have not involved the collaborative formulation of performance objectives, make generalized evaluations.

The following example illustrates how client-centered evaluation might work. Suppose that the principal, near the end of the school year, invited his teachers to give a general reaction to his overall performance. Several teachers, in unsigned evaluations, indicated that he had been too inaccessible, that it seemed inordinately difficult to get in touch with him, especially when problems arose and they felt the need to talk with him.

Using this input from staff, the principal and his evaluator, at the beginning of the ensuing year, might design a specific performance objective, the essence of which should be to make accessibility to staff members a high priority. They might design activities to achieve this ob-

jective, such as systematically inquiring of teachers when they would like the principal to be available for consultation, making a systematic effort to advise the personnel in the principal's office where he can be reached at all times, rebudgeting his time, and so on. The principal might keep a record of the number and timing of his consultations with teachers and use this during the evaluation activities late in the year when he and his evaluator assess how well he has achieved the cooperatively determined performance objectives.

In addition to this target, which grew out of client input, the principal could advise his staff of the other performance targets he and his evaluator have agreed upon. Knowing his work objectives, teachers could then be alert throughout the year to look for evidence of how well he is achieving them. When the time once more came for his staff to evaluate his performance, teachers would be better able to react not only to overall performance, but more specifically to the targets he had been working on during the year.

The evaluator and evaluatee will give consideration to the teachers' evaluations to see how this year's answers to the question of the principal's availability compare with last year's. Obviously, the numerical comparison will be helpful. But in addition, the teachers' evaluations may reveal ancillary reasons why the principal has or has not achieved his goal as satisfactorily as he had hoped to. For example, the data might show that, while the principal is available for consultation, he promises too much too readily at the conference without following through, so that the teachers feel it has not been fruitful to consult with him. In this way, the teachers' evaluations will serve both to assess goal achievement and to prepare for the formulation of performance objectives for the following evaluation period.

In this example, the teachers have participated, through their evaluator roles, in the establishment of a performance objective, in activities to achieve the objective (the inquiry regarding convenient times for consultation with the principal), in assessing how well it has been achieved, and in pinpointing causes of success or failure for future enhancement or correction. Generally, then, by managing the desire of clients to make effective judgments about the leadership and service they are receiving, through collecting more comprehensive data to be used in evaluation by performance objectives, school administrators can bring client perspectives directly to bear on producing what clients and administrators are both seeking: improved output.

The fact that the teachers in the illustration provided two evaluations, as well as other input in the process, suggests that the effectiveness of client-centered evaluations will be maximized if they are incorporated into an ongoing evaluation system on a consistently recurring basis. Emerging primarily in the late sixties, client-centered evaluation is being tried in a small but growing number of school districts or individual schools around the country. So far, however, it is infrequently mandatory or systematic. Sometimes, for example, a principal has established a program in his school for teacher evaluation of himself or student evaluation of teachers. This may be voluntary or compulsory. More far-reaching programs are in existence, even encompassing systemwide evaluation of central office administrators and services. They rarely mesh, however, with an overall evaluation system. Before client-centered evaluation can realize its full potential for improving education and easing tension through shared responsibility and authority for performance assessment, it will have to spread more widely among school systems and become an integral part of the total evaluation program on a regular rather than a sporadic basis.

Full Commitment Essential

It would be naive to underestimate the destructive power of forces of change if improperly managed. The precondition for effective response to these forces is the perception that they *can* operate for positive good and improvement. The school administrator who perceives them as simply threats to cherished tradition and his own proclivity toward unilateral decision making can give an enlightened response only by accident or miracle. A sham response, based on a lack of genuine commitment to their positive potential, augments the original problems with the administrator's loss of credibility. It may also mean that what could have been a collaborative effort by a wide range of people who share power will become another unilateral exercise of power by a new group which wrested it amidst polarization, turmoil and crisis. In other words, today's wisdom says, if you don't share the power, you can't keep it.

School administrators, instead of viewing this trend with defensiveness and alarm, need to recognize that their clients legitimately deserve to share power; that their clients have a genuine and responsible role to play in evaluating professional school personnel who serve and lead them. From their position on the receiving end, clients are competent to judge whether the goods are being delivered.

A concomitant good is that client-centered evaluation can stimulate a critical reexamination of the school system's goals to bring the planners and those for whom the planning is done into cooperation and agreement. In designing client evaluation instruments school administrators may have to ask themselves, for example, how much latitude the system wants the teacher to have in innovating curriculum. Should the feedback from the eval-

uation program reveal that parents do not want teachers to depart from traditional curricula in, say, the political or governmental area, while students expect them to do so, and some teachers are doing so and some are not, collaborative adjustments may be called for.

Obstacles To Be Overcome

School administrators may anticipate that they will encounter obstacles both in instituting a system of client-centered evaluation and in operating it fully and effectively. In the former category, resistance on the part of prospective evaluatees to a new form of examination from a new direction should be expected, although the voluntary programs now being tried at various evaluatees' initiatives are a hopeful sign. Resistance may be based upon unspoken doubts about how the prospective evaluatees look to their clients, or fear that the proposed system will not provide clear safeguards against vindictiveness and manipulation. The evaluatee may also be apprehensive lest clients' unfavorable comments influence the judgment of his superiors.

Many of these problems can be alleviated by careful planning of an integrated, cooperative, balanced program of evaluation in which the evaluatee himself participates in forming the judgments and actions based on the clients' inputs. Clearly communicating how the system will work and sharing the responsibility for designing it are also desirable strategies for winning support and cooperation.

The institution of a systemwide client-centered evaluation program could become a bargaining point in negotiations with teachers and administrative bargaining units. (In August 1970 the Educational Research Service identified two negotiated agreements in which teachers gained the right to annual evaluations of administrators.) Top management's consistent role should be to press for comprehensive client-centered evaluation so that no segment of the client community or the professional staff feels that it alone is being denied a voice in assessing the performance of those in authority.

A remaining obstacle to initiating a program of this type is inertia. It takes more energy to get it going than to keep it going. Current trends offer opportunity and hope, however. Pressure for accountability may provide impetus for overcoming resistance to change in this area. And, fortunately, since so many school systems are working on restructuring their evaluation programs, planning mechanisms may already be in operation which could take over the tasks of designing instruments and procedures for client-centered evaluation and of incorporating this type of evaluation into the overall program.

Planning the client-centered evaluation program will entail overcoming obstacles to effective operation. There have to be safeguards against—

- Influencing the client's evaluation through anticipation of rewards or fear of reprisals.
- Creating security in the evaluatee.
- Making appraisals that do not tell the whole story.
- Giving an unbalanced emphasis to the client evaluations in the overall evaluation.
- Making the administrative evaluator uncomfortable in his role because clients' evaluations have been shared with him.

The 1970 ERS Circular No. 5, *The Evaluatee Evaluates the Evaluator,* not only lists school systems currently using some form of client-centered evaluation, but also indicates the disposition of completed evaluation forms. Different types of safeguards are exercised.

The foremost safeguard is for the evaluatee to receive the evaluation forms directly rather than to have them sent to his superior. In most instances the evaluatee is privileged to dispose of the evaluations as he sees fit. In some situations, he is obliged to discuss the evaluative reactions with his evaluator. Another practice, which is not common, is to have the forms go directly to the evaluatee's immediate superior, who summarizes them and holds a conference with the evaluatee. One school system has an arrangement with a research bureau at a nearby university making it possible for the forms to be processed there with the results later sent to the evaluatee.

While it is difficult to generalize, it would seem that the following safeguards are worth considering:

1. Make the clients' evaluations anonymous.
2. Have the evaluatee receive the forms directly.
3. Let the evaluatee take the initiative in conferring with his evaluator regarding clients' assessments.
4. Let the evaluatee decide when to make the summary of the clients' evaluations a part of his personnel record.

Meaning of Client-Centered Evaluation

Client-centered evaluation offers a way to correct constructively the strange contradiction that those whose servants we are are not those with meaningful authority over us. We have been used to saying we are evaluated by the people we work for, meaning those with authority over us, in other words, our bosses. Client-centered evaluation adds an important new concept to the traditional approach to performance assessment. It provides inputs from those whom we guide, teach, lead, and benefit—in other words, those for whom we truly work.

The author acknowledges the invaluable assistance provided by Mrs. Kay Back, member of the AASA staff, in the preparation of this article.

March 1972
number 7

The Principalship: Creating and Coping with Change

Back in the days of the ten-cent movie, the hero jumped astride his white horse (and in those days the hero always rode a white horse) and set out to head 'em off at the pass. It seems to me that in terms of where we are, the kinds of problems we are encountering and the kinds of opportunities we know are there, principals should review the "Saturday afternoon solution" as they attempt to create and cope with change.

Robert Benchley once wrote that the world is divided into two groups: those who divide the world into two groups and those who don't. I suppose I fall in the former group because I see two groups of principals: the active and the reactive. The active are those in command, who move toward some kind of predetermined goal, who seem to be causing things to happen. They are the instigators, the self-starters, the take-charge people. The reactive are those who respond. They can be good people; but they are always forced to fight on a battlefield not of their own choosing. For them, life seems to be a series of counter-punches. If their reflexes are toned up sufficiently, they not only survive but they succeed, in their fashion.

Although they frequently don't think so, principals have some options in deciding to which of these groups they will belong. I believe that, in the past, principals have primarily been reactive—like Matt Dillon's giving everybody else the chance to draw first and then trying to beat them to the gun. That makes *Gunsmoke* a tantalizing Monday night experience, but I believe that it is a less than desirable position for principals to take. The reactive role means that, at best, one can only catch up—at the very best, he can counteract, respond, nullify, implement—but he is always behind, running in races which, even if won, are not necessarily the events that he would have chosen to enter. A principal's leadership is always diluted by the fact that he is forced to do things that he didn't choose to do, at times and at places selected by someone else. I believe, as I indicated, that this is a rather unfortunate posture for principals to take.

With some notable exceptions, principals have allowed their job descriptions, their roles and their definitions to be defined by other people and have had to try and live up to the decisions. We need to look very seriously at what might be done to reverse this concept. Principals, because of the uniqueness of position, background and philosophy, should be ideal, active leaders in education. From a positional point of view, the principal, by virtue of where he sits, has a broader perspective than the teacher; yet he has a better focus than the superintendent or the school board. He is simultaneously removed from the necessity to plan the day-by-day, minute-by-minute experiences that youngsters will have. Yet, at the same time, he is constantly in a position to see the effect of any particular policy, practice or procedure, and what impact it has on children. As principals, our background is both teaching and administration, and we do not deny the necessity for having backgrounds in both these areas. Our philosophy is humanistic rather than subject-centered or system-centered. For all these reasons, I believe it would be a tragic loss to education in general, and children in particular, if principals did not begin to assume a far more active role in creating and coping with change in education.

William L. Pharis, executive secretary, National Association of Elementary School Principals, Washington, D.C., prepared this article, "The Principalship: Creating and Coping with Change," for *The School Administrator*. It is the seventh in a series of twelve essays on the general subject "Proposals for Progress: Promise and Performance."

What do these fine phrases mean? They are noble thoughts and idealistic dreams, but a pure heart and a princely bearing are not worth much in the kind of rock 'n sock, give 'n take tumble that constitutes today's schools. We need noble thoughts; but we also need blueprints from which we construct better educational opportunities for boys and girls. However, education is in motion. It will not stop while principals gear themselves up to move to the front. We've got to head it off at the pass. Secondly, once we have headed it off and we're in front of the posse, we must have both a fast horse and a sure saddle—because it is awfully tough up in front of the crowd.

Blueprints for Action

Having given the opening charge, let me try to give you some blueprints that appeal to me.

The principal is the single most important key to what happens or does not happen in the schools. With the guidance of the superintendent, the board of education makes educational policy. Principals must translate educational policy into educational programs. Without the commitment of principals, educational change is blunted at the label-adoption stage. For instance, a decision by the board to nongrade the schools can result in changing "first grade" to "primary one" and business goes on as before.

We need to learn to distinguish between structural change and attitudinal change. Structural change is overt and visible. It can be as dramatic as a new "open space school" plant or as mundane as rearranging the library schedule. Structural change, while easy to see, is not necessarily related to improved educational experiences for boys and girls.

Attitudinal change, on the other hand, does not even require rearranging the desks; it means a shift in perception. Thus, a true nongraded school is not an organizational plan —it is a state of mind. It is an attitude that accepts a child and tries to provide appropriate learning experiences for him without regard to any arbitrary notion about what every child should do at any predetermined time.

As this article proceeds, it will be obvious that it is the attitudinal changes that are of most concern, for attitudinal change will sire structural change—but there is only slight evidence that the reverse is true.

One of the first things I think we need to do is to critically examine the nature of what we believe about man's relationship to man.

Now, much like my opening paragraphs, we have some very fine, noble thoughts. Our instincts are good, our hearts are pure. But somewhere between the parking lot and the classroom we sometimes lose what it is we intended to do about relationships in our schools. We don't appear to be really dedicated to our humanistic philosophy. At least it doesn't show up in our organizations.

If, in fact, we believe that every man, regardless of race, color, creed or national origin, is entitled to equal opportunity, we cannot continue to run the kinds of schools that turn around and measure the worth and dignity of people by standardized achievement tests. If every man is an extension of divinity, as we sometimes think he is, we have to stop believing that those who read well are more divine than those who don't. We have to create organizations and run schools in which, rather than sermons, we have practices that illustrate, so that any village idiot can see, that we believe in the worth and dignity of people. We must no longer be a party to groupings, or tracks, or organizations that tend to demean human beings. What right do we have, under compulsory school laws, to force kids to come to school so that they can be labeled or otherwise abused? So, my first concern, and something I think we can take the lead in changing, is that we quit accepting the kinds of organizations people would shove on us, whoever they are, and start to devise, implement, organize ways of helping people learn—ways that essentially recognize and appreciate a child's humanity and that do not, in fact, cause him to leave with a worse self-image of himself than he had when he came to school.

A second point, which is not thoroughly clear in my own mind but which keeps tickling my fancy, is that we are devoting a great deal of money, effort and anguish to doing something about desegregating or integrating schools. Most of us are totally committed to the concept of equality. At the same time I think we are going to have to reexamine the base on which we have tried to bring about integration. I don't think that integration means that all people have to be like us and that the whole purpose of school is to make them that way. Much like my first point, we have to begin to recognize the divinity, the humanity of a person, regardless of his color—accept him and love him for what he is. Integration means incorporation, not erasure. We have bragged for a long time about a pluralistic society. It is time we show that we believe in it. We must show that, regardless of color, regardless of race, regardless of religious belief, we accept people as they are and we try to teach them, not remake them into some predetermined and inappropriate image of what people should be. But to do this we are going to have to devise programs and activities that are deliberately designed to teach students to appreciate and value differences in people. If we don't, then all our busing is a waste of gasoline and a cruel hoax for children.

The third point on which we can begin to act is the broad area of what we are calling teacher militance. At this point I am going to

speak, I hope, as an educator and not as a principal. From my point of view I think the concept of teachers going on strike or on work stoppage (by whatever name you may choose) is a disastrous strategy to use. I do not for a minute deny teachers, or anyone else, the right to be militant, the right to be aggressive, the right to want a part of the action. But I think that the work stoppage, and I'll lump everything under that term, is bankrupt in terms of its ability to help us provide any real gains in education. In all of those situations in which I have studied the results of work stoppages, education is in a far worse condition than it was before this tactic was used. Tactics such as binding arbitration or other strategies that are available to us should be considered as alternatives. I'd hope that we could begin to talk to teachers, not in terms of denying them the right to bargain—far from it—but in terms of saying that if you really want achievement, look critically at those school systems and those individual schools where there has been a work stoppage and see the aftermath. The consequences are disastrous for teachers, for administrators, for kids and for the community. The present low priority for education and the diminishing pool of community support are vivid testimony to the bitter fruit of teacher work stoppages.

It is time that we separate two propositions: having teachers working and bargaining for better conditions is totally worthwhile; but using a strike as a weapon, in my opinion, is folly.

Accountability is an emerging area that we must do something about. Most of us, unfortunately, have approached accountability by attempting to hold it at arm's length, hoping it will go away. We need to look carefully into the whole area, and when we do, we will discover that, under this big umbrella called accountability, there are some very desirable things that we can identify and begin to implement.

I'm thinking specifically of the systems approach, which has great merit for helping us somehow to relate what we put into schools to what comes out. We need to look at the whole concept of systems and learn what the implications for our schools should be. Similarly, some performance contract proposals have great merit. After a critical study, we should encourage those we think can help us do a better job in providing sound experience for boys and girls. At the same time I hope that we will reject (loudly, vehemently and with all the heat and passion we can muster) some of the subterfuges that are being sold as accountability. The notion that we can reduce children to some kind of score on a standardized achievement test, regardless of what system we use, flies right in the face of all our philosophy. We should vigorously oppose such schemes. I feel the same way about the voucher system. Any system that would further dissipate the present inadequate financial resources for public education is something that should be opposed.

Consideration of voucher plans brings another unfinished thought to mind. I believe all of us are going to have to review our feelings about the role and contribution of nonpublic schools. Do nonpublic schools have value that should be salvaged? What can we do to preserve the nonpublic school system in this country if it does have a contribution to make? You notice that I didn't say that I wanted to finance them, because I am still wrestling with this one; but I would like for you to wrestle, too. Maybe we can begin to find out what we truly feel about the role of nonpublic schools in the pluralistic society.

Other Change Opportunities

All of those change opportunities could have been listed under a category called "education." If principals are going to be change agents, they will have their greatest impact as leaders of change, or by providing the kind of leadership that will encourage or permit change. To do this we must begin to use what we already know about how to work with people. We have a large backlog of information about how we should behave to provide effective leadership. Much of it could be called common sense, which Mark Twain once said isn't nearly as common as you might think. Out of psychology, social psychology and our own textbooks, we know still other things about leadership. For instance the principals who appear to me to be exercising sound leadership have freed themselves from the necessity of playing God on Judgment Day. They are not continuously looking to see what is wrong with people. They are, instead, looking to see what is right about people; and they are building on the positive achievements and ignoring the weaknesses. That is one of the greatest skills that any of us can have. It is the toughest, however, because something about our nature—the way we were bred or brought up—tends to make it easier for us to see what's wrong than to see what's right. Consequently, because we don't see what is right, we sometimes do not make the effort to let people know that we appreciate what they are doing—to give them the recognition and the reward they deserve for doing a good job. Instead, we feel the obligation to say, "Yes, but . . ." in spite of the fact that we know that isn't sound leadership. Or, to put it another way, most of us have spent quite a few years covering up our weaknesses, and we don't appreciate help in identifying them. We know where they are and we work diligently to keep them from showing. You won't be doing me a favor by publicly announcing them or by putting me in situations that display my inadequacies. It would be far better if you'd work to find something I do well and capitalize on that asset.

The good principals I'm seeing

in operation are able to make people want to do things because the people who work for them know that they will be recognized for what they are doing.

Third, the good leader is a good listener. It is rare to find somebody who really knows how to listen on a one-to-one basis—who is, in fact, listening rather than thinking ahead to "what shall I respond?" Nothing we can do will make us more effective with other people than to get them to begin to believe that we really care enough to listen to what they have to say. If it is a skill, it is one we frequently let deteriorate—example: a teacher comes in to talk and we continue to shuffle papers while we listen. The obvious conclusion is that the teacher's problem does not merit our full attention.

Isn't it time that we really start to recognize that both youngsters and teachers have individual differences? The unkindest thing a principal can do is to make sure that everything is equal for all of the teachers. We need to begin to tailor programs that are built around the strength of people. We need programs in which teachers will be successful because we have tailored the environment so that they would succeed. There was a time when we proudly stood up and boasted that the only way to organize schools was one adult and thirty children. I think that most of us have broken away, either from the self-contained classroom as an organization or the self-contained classroom as an ideal, and, hence, we now have the opportunity to put together kinds of organizations that fit the people within them.

Regardless of what you call that organization, I could think of nothing that would provide better educational experience for boys and girls than to keep them constantly in contact with the teacher who could perform admirably in the area in which they are supposed to be learning.

The curriculum, while being changed in some schools, is still pot-bound. The roots have become so tangled and crowded that life is being strangled out of the school experience. The vast majority of a youngster's school time is devoted to the dead. Nearly everything being studied deals with the past. Social studies means "Who did what where? Science means "What has been done about the nature of our universe?" Mathematics means "What have we already learned about quantitative relations?"

Perpetuation of our cultural heritage is one responsibility of our schools, but should not projection of our heritage be an equally compelling curriculum mandate? Where is the social in social studies? What is happening to our society and what can be done? Shouldn't we begin to assist students in identifying and projecting the consequences of various alternative futures? Why can't pupils consider the social consequences of science and agonize with us over the implications for our future? How can we help students comprehend that, in a computer age, numbers are beginning to be the most practical language for both the identification and transmittal of information?

These are but a few of the changes that principals must both create and cope with in schools today.

John Gardner once said, "Most policies were created to solve problems which no longer exist." To succeed, all educational administrators must learn to value tradition but not to worship it. While there is no guarantee that any change is an improvement, neither can we assume that what we have been doing is what needs to be done. To paraphrase a famous axiom: Principals must learn to change what can be changed, accept what cannot be changed, and recognize the difference between the two.

April 1972
number 8

Some Thoughts on Accountability

One finds in the current literature a remarkable number of books advocating destruction of the school as we know it. Nor do these revolutionary ideas hide on library shelves. Often issued in paperback, they appear everywhere and sometimes end up as best sellers. A public so ready to read about change may be ready in fact to support it, to permit or even demand more fundamental changes than anything we have yet seen in this century.

What, the public wants to know, is my school doing for my child? Or what, some may ask, is it doing *to* him? What, the taxpayer asks, is my school doing for me? And again, what is it doing *to* me?

Though the epidemic proportions of this problem are new, the public's concern has been mounting for some time. In the 50's we pondered "why Johnny can't read"; in the 60's the slogan was "the pursuit of excellence." More recently we have been hearing a great deal about "accountability," especially in Presidential and other political references to schools.

The term *accountability* demands some attention. I will make no attempt to define what the originator meant by it; I suspect he, like the Queen in *Alice in Wonderland*, used the term to mean exactly what he intended it to mean, no more and no less. But I will attempt to explore several definitions I see in it, and survey the appeal they have for the public in the educational context of today.

The demand for accountability implies our desire to make schools respond to us, be understandable, and do what they promise. In my estimate the word has six shades of meaning, in three general categories —three pairs, let us say. The first pair has to do with cause and effect —in other words, with responsibility for a result:

1. Whatever is accountable for something is a cause of it, is responsible for it, has brought the thing about, can be credited with the results if they are good, or blamed for them if they are bad. So in an armed forces school, a very high percentage of those entering are expected to emerge as qualified technicians; if not, the instructors are transferred.

2. Whatever is accountable is predictable, promised, capable of being relied on to produce certain results, as certain schools report 99 percent of their graduates being admitted to college, or guarantee placement in specified jobs for their graduates.

The first pair of meanings then has to do with producing results, being responsible for them and able to promise them. The second pair concerns being understood, either

3. Understandable by common sense, at first hand, or by simple observation, or

4. Understandable after being explained, interpreted, or demonstrated.

Obviously, if we make ourselves accountable in the first two of these ways, we have nearly accomplished the next pair. The more we know about how to get certain results, the easier it is to make the process comprehensible to others. The more conscious a teacher's mastery of his craft, the greater his ability to communicate with the public.

The final set of meanings for accountability has to do with holding the schools to their responsibilities, making them answerable for what they do. Among the six concerns these two are in one sense the most novel, and yet in another sense the most traditional. They may account

---

H. Thomas James, president, The Spencer Foundation, Chicago, Illinois, presented this article, "Some Thoughts on Accountability," to *The School Administrator*. It is the eighth in a series of 12 essays on the general subject, "Proposals for Progress: Promise and Performance."

for a great number of changes in the near future, as they have already led to a substantial number of experiments.

5. To be accountable can mean to be liable, bound as by contract to a duty, required as by law to complete a work satisfactorily; to suffer the consequences if one fails. This, in an older view, was what a teacher's contract meant; in the newer view, it applies to performance contracting, in which a firm agrees to perform certain instructional services for fixed fees, and to be penalized if student performance falls below agreed-upon levels.

6. Finally, accountable can mean subject to audit, to the taking of inventory, and to the balancing of accounts; open to inspection, to verification, particularly from the standpoint of being economical and prudent and demonstrating good management or stewardship. In the past we have attached this meaning to the board of education's financial stewardship; perhaps we are coming to expect an audit of the instructional stewardship as well.

As we examine these meanings associated with accountability, we begin to see why the term has caught on so quickly and appealed so broadly. For the perennial critics of the schools, it provides a convenient shorthand to summarize all of the major charges they have leveled at schoolmen over the years—irresponsible, unpredictable, incomprehensible in the "baffiegab" or "educationese" they speak, incapable of either explaining or demonstrating what they are doing, never held liable for their failures. The term appeals also to the parent who would like to fix responsibility for his child's success or failure at learning, to anticipate his progress, to understand what his teachers are talking about, to have them explain and demonstrate what they do and what he can do to help. "Accountability" appeals to the parent who wants to know that teachers are committed to their obligations and will take the blame when it is deserved. Finally, accountability appeals to the taxpayer who would like to see the whole operation—both the fiscal and the educational records—audited.

Yet the school administrator, as the responsible head of the school, is left virtually defenseless in all categories except the sixth, and there can depend only on his records of fiscal management, which are badly in need of extensive reorganization. First, no ledger of educational gains and losses or inventory of the faculty's pedagogical skills exists. The results of teaching are measured after a long period of time in which many teachers are involved with a given child; to assign one cause for failure among so many contributions is virtually impossible under existing arrangements for schooling. Second, despite studies (such as Benjamin Bloom's) that argue the feasibility of predicting future performance, few teachers are willing to make such predictions or to guarantee performance levels. Third, the typical superintendent rarely can admit to understanding all his teachers, let alone guarantee that they will understand each other, or be understood by the public. As for explaining or demonstrating what goes on in a classroom, schoolmen, like churchmen, feel more comfortable with mystique than with plain English. Fourth, the question of liability for results can hardly be raised, for the teacher's contract obligates him to no more than being in certain places at certain times, playing a given role, such as "English teacher," as he imagines it should be played.

From the standpoint of the state, most of the existing requirements for accountability again fall into category six, dealing with fiscal operations and with counting pupils and personnel in specified categories. The only general expectation as to pupil progress that districts are required by the state to meet is that progress through grades shall equate roughly with age groups. That professional discourse about schools be intelligible, or actions related to school personnel be explainable or demonstrable, seems not to have concerned those who wrote school laws, and matters of liability are confined to narrowly defined "causes" at best remotely related to the performance of students.

Other agencies provide limited remedies to those who seek alternative ways to accountability in education. Private schools are, of course, an alternative for parents who can afford them if they are convinced that public schools are failing their children; the voucher plan, which would make that alternative available to more people, is receiving careful study and experimentation. Performance contracts offered by independent firms promise predictability and liability and are being widely discussed. Some teacher groups, presumably stimulated by the competition, are exploring the possibility of signing performance contracts on their own. As a distinguished attorney and New York State Regent noted recently, if teachers' union contracts continue to become more specific, the employing agency may eventually be in a position to hold the teachers' union liable for unsatisfactory performance, which is precisely what teachers' contracts were supposed to be all about in the first place.

Thus, the variations on the reward-and-punishment approaches to making schools accountable are on their way to being tested. But to fire a teacher, to refuse payment when a contractor fails or to abandon the public school altogether doesn't help much if there is no replacement; nor will a teacher or a businessman voluntarily enter a performance contract unless he is sure he has a good chance of succeeding. Threats and promises in themselves may inspire better work toward results; but the accountability we seek probably resides not in systems of sanctions imposed by the governing board, but rather in standards enforced by asso-

ciations of professional educators.

The why and how of teaching and learning, however, are still the most puzzling aspects of accountability. The notion that any teaching method that works is good teaching is so pervasive among American educators and so widely accepted that we have made little progress in this century in developing sound pedagogical theories out of which sound professional standards can develop. The problem seems to be that any innovation tried by a dedicated teacher and carried through with passion and commitment works once. We thus have developed an incredible array of methods, each proven by its creator, which not only do not advance our theoretical constructs but actually get in the way of professional standards and school improvement, because *ad hoc* methods often fail when others attempt to put them into practice. The 1960's produced a remarkable range of experimentation with teaching methods. One hopes that scholars will find, through study of these new developments, ways of generalizing about them so as to advance pedagogical theory, and that the advancement of theory can then influence development of professional standards that will improve educational practice. Practice is poorly served by pedagogical theory at present, and practice is the poorer for this lack.

The current interest in accountability in education, particularly as expressed through performance contracts and vouchers, is likely to have profound consequences on schools, not all of them worth the effort being spent, and some of them, in my opinion, potentially disastrous. Those who most enthusiastically promote accountability as a lever for change are accustomed to analyzing problems through the use of mechanistic models—such models as the cost-benefit analysis, systems analysis, program planning and budgeting systems—which have proven useful to engineers, economists and business firms. When goals are simple, and when the means for achieving them can be devised from hardware, the models are easy to apply and work well. *Some* school problems, such as transport and food services, it is true, yield to mechanistic analysis. But when it is people we deal with, not hardware, and when the goals we seek are complex human attributes, the mechanistic models are of less help. As we try to use these handy models to improve education, we may do one of two things: (a) We may apply the models to problems too broad and complex for them to encompass. (b) Determined to make the models work, we may restate the problem in simpler terms; instead of abandoning the model, we abandon the problem.

In some of our first efforts at accountability in schools, we seem to be doing the second of these: limiting our goals to the easily measurable, the relatively inconsequential. Performance contracting, for example, has aroused much excitement; it satisfies a cost-benefit model; it guarantees accountability. But what are we contracting for? Only the reaching of certain grade-level standards in reading and arithmetic. One can argue that these are vital goals of education, but are they so vital that they deserve our exclusive attention? If we teach the child to read and to count, the people will ask, as Plato did, why haven't we also taught him to be virtuous?

Since 1900 our society has been notably unsuccessful in stating its aims for education. The prospect of allowing ourselves to be pressured by narrow concerns, driven by casual circumstances—like our rather uncritical embrace of "accountability" —into setting trivial goals for our educational institutions is appalling. For the long range, we desperately need to stop preoccupying ourselves with the trivial; we need to shape our goals to fit our broadest perceptions of the needs of human life, to challenge our model builders to reach toward these goals, and to be critical of failures to reach them.

Let me touch briefly on the primary aims of education as I find them expressed in the historical documents of our society, aims that I believe still run robustly through the hopes of our people. Now is a propitious time in our history to discover whether we still desire these broader goals, and then, if we do, to alert ourselves to the dangers of the increasing triviality of current efforts to state the aims of education.

For the early founders of schools in this country the aims of education were, quite simply, piety, civility and learning, three forms of behavior extensively discussed in the literature of the 16th and 17th centuries.

The concern for piety meant that children must be taught to read in order to study the Bible and grow in religious faith, spiritual mindedness, temperance, purity, righteousness and charity, and thereby join the elect, those to be saved after death, the children of God.

The concern for civility involved teaching of good manners and deportment, prudence, courtesy and thoughtfulness, gentleness, tolerance and graciousness toward others.

Educational writings of the 18th century reflected the growing impact of the enlightenment upon the popular consciousness. Piety, secularized, became "virtue"; the concept of civility became "citizenship," reflecting a growing interest in the political philosophers who thought the importance of education lay in its development of the capacity for self-government; and more emphasis was placed on knowledge considered scientifically and morally useful. The Northwest Ordinance of 1787 combines the earlier aims of 17th century education and the new emphasis of the 18th in its opening words: "Religion, morality and knowledge being necessary to good government, schools and the means of education shall be forever encouraged."

The concern for morality per-

sisted as part of the curriculum throughout the 18th century—in fact, late into the 19th, notably in the *McGuffey Readers*. As knowledge proliferated, especially in the sciences and in mathematics, the emphasis on knowledge increased the number of subjects taught in the schools and gave birth to the confused notion, still with us, that learning facts is educative.

In the 19th century the industrial revolution created a new expectation for the schools, that is, that they teach children to be productive. With its connotations of fruitfulness, creativity and ingenuity, gainful employment and investment, productivity is perhaps best epitomized in the Morrill Act of 1862 establishing the land grant colleges, and in succeeding efforts to encourage vocational education and manpower training that have continued right up to the present Congressional deliberations.

Our own century continues to use and develop aims of the past. Piety, virtue, or "ethics," implying the effort to find a moral basis for action, is still a broadly recognized aim today. Certainly the old concept of civility is still with us, if evidenced only by the persistent cries for its restoration to discourse and relationships in the present. We unquestionably still promote as a goal the pursuit of knowledge the intellectual or "cognitive" aspects of education, adding to this a concern—perhaps new, perhaps only a version of piety and civility—for the capacity to feel and to empathize. Our concern for good citizenship and self-government are, if anything, stronger than ever before.

In some ways the old aims are adapting to a new world. The aim of citizenship is reaching out from narrow community concerns to a deeper national and international consciousness and to a new awareness of the environmental consequences of our actions. Although the concern for productivity persists, broadened in our own century by a balancing concern for rational consumption and worthy use of leisure time, in light of our population growth and other economic, social and natural changes, it must be nearing a major transformation; young voices of dissent, at least, tell us so. Our curricular choices in the last two decades show a deeper concern for justice in the distribution of social and economic benefits than earlier; and judging from our recent graduates, the lessons have been well-learned. In these days there seems to be a special need, above all, to teach hope, for in this virtue our current graduates seem sadly deficient. And while we have made some progress, we need to extend our efforts to have schools conducted more humanely, to make them happy and joyful places to be.

These, then, are some of the traditional aims of education in our society, with some speculation on those emerging. I think no one can seriously argue that any of the concepts is irrelevant in our time. One can argue that they are global concepts derived from philosophy and religion, and therefore of little use in an age that seeks to define its educational objectives in behavioral terms. My reply would be that these aims do describe behaviors—how a human being treats his neighbors, the actions he takes part in and approves, what he initiates in his own life. It was with these aims for education in mind that state legislatures enacted the laws that established the state school systems throughout the 19th century and into the 20th. More important, it is in terms of these aims that the larger controversies and criticisms of the schools are still phrased. We can stir national concern about how Johnny can't read, but when citizens meet in their local communities to discuss the problem, the discussion shifts to Johnny's behavior, his dress, the length of his hair, his morals, his religious attitudes, his values and what he's thinking of doing with his life. And it is in terms of these aims that the educational leaders, the programs, the faculties and the students of schools of the future will be judged.

Can we encourage existing leaders, and develop new ones, who will restate and elaborate these historic aims—men great enough to match the great ideas that are certain to persist in the minds of our people? Can we develop new pedagogical theories and, from these theories, the kinds of standards and criteria that will show us how well our educational institutions are meeting, not their minor tasks, but their exalted ones? Many people of good will think so and are now going about this work in many ways. One hopes that they will come to view the aims of education profoundly, and set our goals, not in the small scale suggested by the mechanistic models so popular today, but rather according to the scale of our great tradition.

May 1972
number 9

Organizational Renewal: The Superintendent's Role

There are two important mechanisms for producing organizational renewal. One is leadership; the other is coalition. The superintendent has a stake in both.

Leadership

Leadership is an interesting phenomenon. One can learn about it in various ways. He can observe a good leader at work and then attempt to emulate what he considers to be the leader's best characteristics. But oftentimes in judging other persons, especially those in leadership positions, our personal prejudices and biases confuse our thinking, and therefore our judgment is apt to become clouded with opinion rather than fact.

Research and Leadership

Another way of learning about leaders is to examine what research has to say about leadership. Since 1900 there have been about five hundred separate pieces of research on leadership. Prior to 1935 scholars were attempting to identify certain personality characteristics or essential traits considered necessary for the leadership role. Scholars investigated intelligence and achievement and their relation to leadership. One of the early pieces of research done on intelligence suggested that a person with a high IQ possessed considerable leadership potential. But in recent years this early finding has been disputed. Being smart may help, but it isn't enough. After almost half a century of extensive research in the leadership field, scholars have departed from the idea that character traits are identified with leadership. They have concluded from their investigations a few rather fundamental principles.

One principle is that leadership is a group role. No one travels the leadership street alone. A leader needs people with whom he can work and interact if he is to be effective. Therefore, leadership will accrue as people participate in groups.

A second principle is that the amount of leadership an individual is able to exert is directly dependent upon the frequency of his contact with other persons.

A third principle is that leadership may occur without a person necessarily having status. Leadership is associated with the person who can carry his own share of responsibility and assist others to help a group achieve a standard or a goal that it has established for itself. Administrators need to be aware that their status position means very little to those persons with whom they must relate in both school and community organizational activities.

In summary, research has this to say about the nature of leadership:

- Leadership is a function of a group.
- Leadership is that quality of the group that determines its effectiveness in establishing and achieving group goals.
- Many people contribute to effective leadership.
- The extent to which people contribute to leadership is determined by the way the members of a group perceive an individual and use his contributions.

George B. Brain, dean, College of Education, Washington State University, Pullman, prepared this article, "Organizational Renewal: The Superintendent's Role," for *The School Administrator*. It is the ninth in a series of 12 essays on the general subject, "Proposals for Progress: Promise and Performance."

Those Selected as Leaders

Research also has some interesting things to say about the kind of people frequently chosen as leaders. People whose leadership contributions are frequently used have six qualities.

One is that they assert initiative. An idea is just an idea as long as it remains dormant. It takes action to give an idea substance or visibility.

The second quality of leadership is a willingness to cooperate. Leadership from the status role tends to make people do what a status leader wants, and as a consequence there is generally a lot more back-biting and a lot more "I" comment in a group than if the status leader helps people plan together, helps people evaluate together, and helps people choose persons with whom they would like to work.

A third quality of leadership is the ability of the individual to communicate. Being a great stone face and having people wonder what one is thinking are not desirable leadership qualities.

A fourth quality is the ability to empathize with others. This is simply the skill of putting oneself into another person's place to sense his feelings. It is part of being a good listener.

A fifth quality is creativity. Groups turn most frequently to that person who can offer a suggestion to help the group solve a particular problem.

Finally, a leader has something to offer that is of service to the group. He may be able to express ideas well. He may be able to give the group some technical knowledge, or he may be able to fight off attackers. Whatever the case may be, leadership is awarded by a group to those persons who are recognized as being capable of service to the group. Being a good fellow is not enough, but putting service to the group above self will have its rewards.

Leader Responsibility for Change

Organizational leadership then is not directing or controlling people. It just doesn't work that way. Leadership is a responsibility. It is a service, and people who are respected for their leadership contributions are those who have something of value to offer in a group situation.

School leaders must create opportunities for changes in attitudes to develop among the staff members involved in the organizational renewal effort. There are many forces that inhibit changes in the schools. Perhaps the most powerful of these is the attitude of the instructional staff toward change. If changes are to be effective, they must be fully acceptable to the staff putting them into practice. But teachers also recognize that changes must be acceptable to the school administrator. One major obstacle to organizational renewal is the fact that teachers have observed from their entire educational experience—elementary, secondary, undergraduate and graduate—that the learning process consists of a teacher telling a group of students what they should know. Unfortunately, some administrators also embrace this concept of teaching. The person who exhibits an attitude toward teaching that differs from the traditional faces at best an apathetic and at worst a hostile community of opinion.

Administrative leaders need to understand that teachers by and large are so busy with the day-to-day tasks of keeping the traditional program in operation that they have little time to stay in contact with the literature of educational research and development. They tend to have the secure feeling that the practices they are following are valid and that there is nothing much different that would compel change. Moreover, too many teachers have observed the fate of the occasional colleague who wants to try a new approach. Nothing very significant occurs as a result of his attempts. Usually he is working alone, so no significant organizational changes can be made. He is rarely given extra budget or equipment considerations. Unless he is extremely persistent, his efforts are fruitless, and he returns to a traditional pattern or leaves the system. Other teachers, observing him, accept the fact that the system is frozen and the individual can't beat it.

These and other causes have created an attitude of resistance to organizational change among the people who are in the best position to effect changes in educational practice. If renewal plans are to be established in the school systems, present attitudes must be changed. The system must be unfrozen. Staff members must be shown that the milieu in which organizational efforts are made is receptive to new ideas. New and emerging knowledge must be brought to the school staff, and staff members must be given the time to read, listen, view, discuss and contemplate these new understandings.

The process of attitude change cannot be hurried. A crash program might bring about a change in procedure or a modification of organizational style, but if valid changes of attitude are wanted, new ideas must be given time to mature.

Staff Renewal

School leaders can encourage organizational renewal by having staff members learn about the new processes of learning through realistically redesigning the program of their own class or school. As staff members acquire new attitudes and understandings about learning and learning processes, a program of instruction about new skills using their newly acquired understandings can be initiated. These skills will range from the very broad to the very specific. All personnel must be given opportunities to learn or at

least to understand the techniques of analysis and design that are allied to the field of operations research, systems analysis and planning. With these skills and understandings they then can begin to analyze their own programs and redesign them to permit more efficient use of human and material resources. Within this kind of organizational framework, staff members will learn how to assess needs, state objectives, establish priorities and evaluate performances in terms of carefully established criteria.

The more specific skills to be acquired are those related to the learning program. Staff members must learn how to describe outcomes in behavioral terms, and how to design learning strategies and programs to obtain these outcomes. Methods for evaluating and reporting must also be devised.

The strategy for the administrative leader should not be to establish static goals, but to develop a staff that is actively engaged in organizational change. In this way organizational renewal becomes integral to the processes of learning.

Educational renewal should not be a by-product of staff effort. The school staff simply cannot decide on some goal, install it and settle down to teaching. The culture is changing so rapidly and developments in the learning sciences are occurring so frequently that program renewal must be an ongoing process. Ways must be found to relieve school staff members periodically so that they can study, design and implement the new ideas acquired from their organizational renewal efforts.

Renewal activities should not be undertaken on an *ad hoc* basis. The school staff will need time to develop both short- and long-range goals. Staff members will need to make intelligent decisions about the organizational changes required to reach these goals. Specific skills must be developed, and techniques of personnel management, management of learning materials and resources, decision making and planning must be considered.

School leaders must seek to create an environment within the school system that goes beyond the passive acceptance or rejection of change by encouraging and rewarding the involvement of staff in the development and installation of new organizational arrangements. In such an environment, the satisfactions of the individual can be identified with the goals of the system. This identification should increase the individual's self-esteem and make the attainment of the goal much more feasible. School staff members want to be creative, to feel that they have an important contribution to make to the school system's objectives.

Evaluation

The evaluation of organizational changes should not be left to chance. An in-depth evaluation process should be established as a basic part of the plan. Preferably the evaluation design should be developed by those who possess skill in the processes of evaluation. The evaluation may be carried out by local staff members or cooperatively with external resources. A wise teacher will involve parents and students in evaluation activities. They should not only have a part in the planning of organizational changes but also provide a major source of feedback for refinement of the various components of the organizational plan.

Coalition

The coalition as a mechanism for producing organizational renewal is not a new arrangement in education. It is an alliance for joint action or purpose to achieve a specific objective. Through a coalition, the cooperative efforts of teachers, administrators, students and citizens of all ages can be brought together and welded into a dynamic thrust. Despite soaring rhetoric to the contrary, no single segment of the school community can go it alone, tempting though this idea may be to some. A joint effort by all is required if organizational renewal is to improve the programs and processes of education. The coalition may be permanent or temporary. Obviously it has a temporal dimension. It can exist as long as the participants feel it necessary to maintain the cooperative efforts.

A coalition can be formal or informal. In a formal coalition all individuals and groups proclaim their interest in working together and are guided by general rules. In an informal coalition the individuals or groups are working and exchanging information on the same problem, but their efforts are not coordinated or directed. In the school setting the formal coalition should be the concern of the school administrator.

To be successful the coalition must have utility; it must be going somewhere; it must be doing something constructive. A coalition dedicated to bringing about the renewal of a school system must have a strong commitment from all members of the educational family. An effective coalition is held together by mutual good will and by a common cause. Good will and commitment to educational improvement are the cement that will bind the members of the school community together into an effective coalition.

The successful coalition must have consensus on the objectives to be achieved. A majority vote for a position to be taken does not mean that the position is the best one. A margin of one vote is a shaky foundation on which to build plans for school improvement.

An effective coalition is built on the self-interest of its members, both individually and collectively. Teachers will join in the coalition with administrators because of

mutual self-interest. This self-interest can take several forms. One form is the growing realization that the majority of the profession cannot prosper if one crucial part of it languishes. Students and parents will join the coalition because it is to their advantage to do so. Better learning opportunities and qualitative improvements in programs and processes will be the result.

The coalition must also be issue oriented. It should use the rifle rather than the shotgun approach. In organizational renewal the coalition ought to focus on limited, narrow objectives rather than taking on all the problems of the school system at the outset. The limited objective approach will enable like-minded groups to join forces to work toward achieving that objective.

Another requirement for a successful coalition is that the persons involved not assume an "all or nothing" posture. Rarely can a group of individuals achieve the ideal objective. If the coalition takes the position that only the ideal will be acceptable, its effectiveness will be negligible. The continued existence of the coalition will depend on achieving some victories, some successes. This doesn't mean that all battles will be won, but that the effort spent must result in something constructive.

Coalitions are useful mechanisms in organizational renewal because of their flexibility and applicability to different settings. A coalition can be formed to help resolve a problem at the building level, in a subject matter area, or on a systemwide basis.

A successful coalition needs adequate financial resources in order to reach its goals. Motivation and commitment are important ingredients for success, but they must be buttressed by the financial support necessary to purchase resources and to communicate. The availability of a budget for these needs is an important fact of life in the renewal plan.

A final criterion for a successful coalition is that it must develop its strategy carefully. Of paramount importance is the strength of the threat. Unfortunately some kind of threat seems to be needed to alter the *status quo*. What is needed is enough of a threat to cause the majority to start changing its own attitude and allocation of resources in ways far more favorable to the needs of education, but not so much of a threat as to cause the withdrawal of community cooperation, understanding and support. Pressure must be applied to bring about change; the key question is how much pressure.

Knowing how much pressure to exert and how to organize resources effectively are functions of leadership. To be successful in bringing about organizational renewal, a coalition must have dynamic leadership—leadership that will inspire those involved to exert their best efforts, leadership that will give the coalition vitality and excitement. Leadership is necessary to attract the support of community groups to the cause of education. The leadership must be of such quality that it is recognized by citizens at all levels of society.

It is the leadership role that the superintendent can best fulfill. Leadership is not a precise science. When people are cranked into the organization equation, their ambitions, imaginations, fears, frailties and strengths are included. Marshalling their efforts for the best in organizational performance calls for the best of leadership. It requires effort and imagination. That is what the superintendent's role in the organizational renewal process is all about.

June 1972
number 10

The Decade of Reform in Educational Finance

With a zeal previously absent, Americans—from Richard M. Nixon to John Doe—have been examining the policy questions of educational finance since that day in August 1971 when six California judges ruled in favor of John Serrano. The decision and the events *Serrano* has precipitated represent an extraordinary opportunity for reform of the structure and financing of American education.

To place the *Serrano* issue in perspective, I will briefly review the current situation, some of the more prominent reform proposals, and then discuss some of the more probable consequences of *Serrano* for education in the 1970's.

The Present

Unlike most other advanced nations, the United States does not centrally control or finance its elementary and secondary schools. Each state government has the authority to establish and maintain its own schools. In pursuit of this goal, each state except Hawaii has established local school districts to operate and administer its schools.

Relying upon local property taxes, these local districts provide, on the average, about 54 percent of school revenues in the United States. States supplement local monies with varying amounts and types of state aid; on the average, such aid amounts to about 40 percent of school revenues. The remaining 6 percent comes from federal sources.

When state legislatures delegated the power to tax property to localities, they made a grossly unequal grant of power. Rich school districts have far more taxing power per pupil than other districts. The wealthiest districts in a state can be several hundred times w althier than the poorest. These disparities become serious inequities when one examines their fiscal and educational consequences, and the American ethic of equal educational opportunity becomes a hoax rather than a reality.

To compensate for this inequality, states have established state aid equalization programs. But none of these equalization or foundation programs have equalized either educational services or tax burdens.

Regular increases in state and local taxes have been needed just to maintain existing levels of school services—let alone provide the additional services which research and experience indicate are necessary.

The recent court cases, like a *deus ex machina,* have come to stage center at an opportune moment. In New Jersey, Texas and California (among others), state and federal courts have ruled in favor of plaintiffs contending that the current system of school financing violates rights guaranteed by the equal protection clause of the 14th Amendment, as well as certain state constitutional provisions. The New Jersey case of *Robinson* vs. *Cahill* is now on appeal to the New Jersey Court of Appeals; the Texas case, *Rodriguez* vs. *San Antonio School District,* decided by a three-judge federal court, is now on appeal to the U.S. Supreme Court; and California has decided not to appeal *Serrano* vs. *Priest.*

Undeniably the most dramatic, *Serrano* vs. *Priest* is widely regarded as the most significant court case for public schools since the desegregation case of the mid-1950's. In *Serrano,* the California State Supreme Court held that "this funding scheme invidiously discriminates against the poor because it makes the quality of

---

James A. Kelly, program officer, The Ford Foundation, and associate professor, Teachers College, Columbia University, prepared this article, "The Decade of Reform in Educational Finance," for *The School Administrator.* It is the tenth in a series of twelve essays on the general subject, "Proposals for Progress: Promise and Performance." *The views expressed herein are the views of the author.*

a child's education a function of the wealth of his parents and neighbors. Recognizing as we must that the right to an education in our public schools is a fundamental interest which cannot be conditioned on wealth, we can discern no compelling state purpose necessitating the present method of financing. We have concluded, therefore, that such a system cannot withstand constitutional challenge and must fall before the equal protection clause."

The Many Faces of Reform

The Maryland General Assembly, during its 1971 session, provided for the state's assumption of all school construction costs. A study made by the Citizens' Commission on Maryland Government concluded that the state should assume the "total financial responsibility" for all public schools in Maryland. To be phased in over a three-year period, the plan would ultimately raise all districts to the 1970-71 level of the highest expenditure district. Funds for compensatory education and special education would be allocated in addition to the per-pupil allocation. The revenues would be raised through state assumption of the local income surtax, a more progressive income tax, more equitable corporate and franchise income taxes, "other taxes to insure fiscal equity," and the remainder "if necessary" through a uniform statewide property tax.

The New York State Commission on the Quality, Cost and Financing of Elementary and Secondary Education—the "Fleischmann Commission"—advocated that New York State institute full state funding of public elementary and secondary education. Funds would be derived initially from a uniform statewide tax on the full value of property—the tax to be levied specifically for education and instituted over a five-year period. The Commission expressed the hope that once full state funding was under way, the statewide property tax could be reduced and the revenues raised through the state income tax. Districts would be ranked on current per-pupil expenditure. Those below the 65th percentile would be leveled up to that rank within three years; those above would remain at their current level until the others had been raised. Equal per-pupil expenditures would be provided throughout the state, except where learning problems—indicated by low achievement test scores—require additional funds. The Commission also recommended statewide collective bargaining for salaries, and income tax credits for property tax payments by lower-income homeowners and tenants. It strongly urged that local districts be forbidden to levy additional taxes to supplement the state allotment, feeling that such supplements would perpetuate the current advantage to rich districts.

While the New York plan would not permit local districts to supplement the state allotment, California is considering several plans that, if enacted, would combine full state funding and "power-equalized" local effort. A uniform statewide property tax would replace the current local levy, ruled unconstitutional in *Serrano*. The state would redistribute the funds to the local district on a per-pupil basis. If it wished, each district could then make an additional effort to increase its total revenues for education. In contrast to the current situation, however, a poor district that makes an additional tax effort would net the same amount as a rich district making the same level of tax effort. This plan incorporates the concept of "district power equalizing" advanced by Coons, Clune and Sugarman in their important book, *Private Wealth and Public Education*. Under their proposal, local districts are allowed to select the level of tax effort they wish to make for education; all communities that tax at a given level receive the same amount per pupil, regardless of the local wealth of the district.

Although the shift from local to state responsibility would be a decided improvement, the study commissions imply and often stress that full state funding will require a federal participation far greater than the current 6 percent. President Nixon has indicated that he intends to submit proposals to Congress for a major overhaul of public school financing. What he will actually propose remains to be seen, however.

Hopes for increased federal support were somewhat dashed by the President's Commission on School Finance. In its recently issued report, the Commission concluded: "The Commission sees the Federal Government performing a leadership and pioneering role in long-range educational policy, but only a supplemental role to the States in the financing of school capital and operating costs." While the Commission advocates full state funding and would have the federal government grant incentives to states that adopt it, the incentives do not provide anywhere near the amount necessary to help the states over the hurdle. Thus, the report provides moral support, but not the financial sustenance needed by the states when and if they make the great leap forward.

Consequences for the 70's

A Backwash Epicycle

As the variety of these proposals illustrates, it is impossible to predict the specific fiscal outcomes of *Serrano*-induced reforms. In this connection, it is disturbing to note what might be called a "backwash epicycle" on the general movement toward reform. I refer to the claims that the *Serrano* cases potentially represent a "millstone" in educational finance. If the states introduce an equal-expenditure-per-pupil solution, the "millstoners" hold, cities may suffer. They further allege that if states institute a statewide property tax to pay for school costs, some cities would suffer because they have a low nominal property tax for schools and would thus have to in-

crease their taxes under the statewide levy.

I argue that these critics, though technically correct in the short run, undermine the enormous potential for reform inherent in the *Serrano* cases. In addition, I believe they underestimate the existing political strength of the cities by miscalculating the capacity of cities to preserve in state legislatures the fiscal position they already hold. There is no practical possiblity, for example, that a *Serrano*-type decision in New York State would lead the legislature to reduce teachers' salaries in New York City. Urban fears about the effects of an equal-expenditure solution to the *Serrano* decision are politically naive, because the same political influences that have operated up until now—presumably to the "benefit" of high-expenditure, low-tax-rate cities—would still operate in a post-*Serrano* legislative battle. Many cities desperately need additional finance resources for education. Many of these same cities, however, have experienced dramatic increases in educational resources during the past decade but have not demonstrated a commensurate increase in effectiveness and productivity.

In my opinion, *Serrano*-stimulated revisions in the financing of education augur well for the battle to increase educational resources available to the poor. To emphasize the possible limitations, rather than to recognize or seize the enormous opportunity, would be a tragic, possibly fatal error in judgment.

Trends

Assuming that the "wealth neutrality" and "fundamental interests" findings of the California Supreme Court are not overturned, three major educational trends will follow from *Serrano*: (1) reform of the governance and fiscal structure of public education; (2) related areas of litigation; and (3) new areas for educational finance research and development. These trends already are discernible in many of the state reform proposals.

Reform of the governance and fiscal structure of public education characterizes the first trend. An almost certain consequence of the *Serrano* cases is a reform of the revenue structure for public education. The current reliance on local property taxes will surely be an early casualty. Because of its yield and elasticity, however, the property tax is not likely to disappear, despite the plaintive cries of purists who object to its alleged regressivity. What is likely to happen—as indicated by several of the reform plans—is that states will return to the practice followed in the late nineteenth century of a statewide property tax. Rising costs for education as well as rising costs for other government sectors will probably require states to increase sales and income taxes along with a statewide property tax. States may or may not be successful in holding the lid on future property tax increases once the tax is shifted to the state level. At any rate, the shift of the property tax base to the state level, with a greater possible reliance on sales and income taxes, will almost certainly improve the equitability of the revenue structure for public education.

A second major fiscal consequence of *Serrano* is likely to be full state assumption of educational expenditures. No one can predict accurately whether states will move toward a system of equal expenditures per pupil or will accept other proposals now extant to vary per-pupil expenditures based upon cost or educational need differentials. Undoubtedly, for political reasons, legislatures will have to adopt unequal per-pupil expenditures during early stages of post-*Serrano* adjustments. If the major city in a state already spends above average for public education, the legislature could manage the continuation or expansion of such above-average expenditures by providing in its finance formulas for variations based upon socioeconomic needs of students, or upon the increased costs of urban educational services. Nothing in *Serrano* indicates that the courts would strike down such provisions should a legislature choose to include them in a formula that met the "wealth neutrality" test. To date, the courts have taken pains not to foreclose the possibility for "rational" differentials in per-pupil expenditures. Another strategy that legislatures could follow in allowing for local variation in expenditures is the "district power equalizing" scheme advanced persuasively by Coons, Clune and Sugarman. This plan is most likely to see the light of day first as an "add-on" provision on top of an essentially equal or need-adjusted state system of school finance.

Improved state policy making and assessment in public education are other likely consequences. The traditional regulatory function of state departments of education will continue, but all branches of state government—executive, legislative and judicial—will play more explicit roles in educational policy making than heretofore has been the case. The next generation of state school finance formulas will channel state funds directly to local school buildings, as distinguished from school districts, and perhaps even pinpoint resources in individual classrooms. Many states already are moving to establish statewide assessment programs so that policy analysts and government leaders can review the effectiveness of educational resource allocations in terms of pupil attainment.

Assessment programs are emerging because significant groups of constituents interested in public education are demanding that legislators hold schools accountable for something more than simply spending appropriated funds in legally approved ways. They are demanding that schools be held accountable for the end results of teaching. They do not particularly care whether a school has high or low expenditures

so long as their children learn how to read. These demands are not restricted to disadvantaged communities; many white, middle-class parents are increasingly disenchanted with the effectiveness of schools.

The day is not yet here when legislatures cut off funds for local schools because the schools' performance on student achievement tests is unsatisfactory. But some states already conduct testing programs each year and base certain remedial and categorical aid programs on the results of the tests. The decade of the 1970's will witness increasing political pressures for state assessment of educational results.

Notwithstanding this trend toward improved and more aggressive state policy making for education, states are likely to continue the deep-seated American custom of maintaining local school boards authorized to make certain types of educational decisions. In particular, school boards are likely to continue to establish curriculum, within general guidelines set by the states, and to employ school personnel, perhaps subject to the provisions of a statewide master contract for teachers. Indeed, it can be argued that once boards are released from the bondage and politics of revenue raising, they will be more effective policy makers in the curriculum and personel areas.

A fifth probable trend is the shift of decisions about teacher salary levels from local school boards to state legislatures. Since teachers' salaries are 65 to 70 percent of most school district budgets, it is quite impractical to discuss equalizing educational expenditures without equalizing teachers' salaries. One approach would be for states to negotiate master contracts focused primarily on wages and fringe benefits for teachers. Legislatures could authorize local boards to negotiate local contracts with teachers on issues other than wages and fringe benefits; in particular, such contracts could focus on working conditions, inservice education and the like.

A final consequence of *Serrano* in the governance and fiscal reform area is the likelihood of a new wave of school district consolidation as the state assumes increased policy-making responsibilities in education. The number of operating school districts in America has already declined from about 130,000 in the 1930's to less than 15,000 in 1972. The number is likely to decline to about 10,000 as two or three states that still have large numbers of small districts proceed with their consolidation. A possible state response to a *Serrano* ruling, suggested by the President's Commission, would be a drastic consolidation of school districts so as to reduce the disparities between rich and poor in wealth and expenditures. Further, if states take an increased interest in the efficiency of educational management, they are likely to provide even stronger incentives or requirements for additional school district consolidation.

A second major trend concerns several types of *Serrano*-related litigation. Some legal scholars and educational finance specialists are discussing strategies for extending the *Serrano* ruling downward into early childhood education, where it is provided by the state, and upward into junior college and community college education. The most obvious obstacle to these extensions of *Serrano* is the fact that the state does not require attendance in junior colleges or in early childhood educational institutions. However, the federal courts have invoked the equal protection clause in voting rights and criminal rights cases where compulsory exercise of the right was not an issue.

Another class of related suits is emerging around the problem of how schools "sort" students. It is customary for schools to group students according to academic ability and grades. Frequently, such grouping practices result in *de facto* racial and socioeconomic segregation of students. Legal scholars are exploring ways of attacking such practices through equal protection litigation.

A third type of related litigation attacks unequal delivery of health and nutrition services to school children, where the state or its subdivisions provide such services. Research indicates that children who are in poor health and malnourished learn less effectively than students who have good health and good diets. If state-supported health care is provided in a discriminatory manner, then it may be subject to attack through the courts in a manner similar to *Serrano*.

A fourth type of related litigation attacks unequal property tax assessments. The assessment of real property in virtually every state is inequitable, haphazard and subject to corruption. Kentucky, Florida and other states have been required by courts in recent years to assess property at full market value, on grounds that their state constitutions required full assessment. Cases now pending in Texas and other states seek to bring the entire range of assessment practices under court scrutiny on grounds that equal protection and due process are violated by grossly unequal treatment of similar properties within a state and within local assessing districts.

A fifth type of related suit seeks to apply an equal protection doctrine to intra-district school expenditures. The case of *Hobson vs. Hanson* in Washington, D.C., has established a precedent for this type of case.

A sixth, and final, example of related litigation applies the equal protection doctrine to the delivery of municipal services. One precedent in this area is a unanimous, three-judge federal court decision requiring that municipal services in Shaw, Mississippi, be provided in a non-discriminatory fashion.

In the field of public education and, in particular, in educational finance, the 1970's should be a fascinating decade.

July 1972
number 11

Schools and Industry Can Be Partners

At a time when school administrators across the country are questioning the wisdom of opening their classroom doors to industry, the Camden Board of Education can report positive results from such cooperation. For two years the RCA Corporation has been deeply involved with the school system in a very unique way through the Camden Educational Development Program (CEDP).

In describing the venture, the key word is "cooperative." Unlike other school systems, such as Gary and Texarkana, which contracted with industry to take over some classroom instruction on a performance basis, Camden Schools contracted with RCA for help in developing staff training programs for all levels of school personnel, and in designing a staff development component for the school system. RCA was not the only group involved with Camden in this venture. According to the original agreement, the Camden Board of Education, the New Jersey Department of Education, the U.S. Office of Education and the Camden community became partners and shared with RCA the responsibility for achieving the objectives.

The need for staff training became apparent to me three and a half years ago, soon after I was appointed superintendent of schools. The first day in office I placed a call to one of the schools. A female voice greeted me with "Hello," making me think for a moment that I had the wrong number. Further questioning established that I had indeed reached the school, but no one was able to tell me where the principal was or when he would be back.

While this anecdote may not be significant in itself, it is symptomatic. Many school board employees are not trained to meet today's needs or to work with children. This is particularly true in urban systems, where problems are compounded by poverty, community apathy and overcrowdedness.

Colleges, for example, have not prepared our teachers to work in urban schools. Many graduates find that the actual classroom situation is quite different from the situation described in textbooks or found in practice teaching experiences. Several of our administrators, too, most of whom began their educational careers as teachers, lack formal training in management skills. On the other hand, many of our nonprofessional employees have had no training whatsoever for their jobs.

This training problem is not unique to education. A large corporation cannot remain competitive unless its employees are truly productive. And to be productive, they may need intensive training.

In the Camden school system, 35 schools serve 21,000 students. In many ways we are a big business, employing some 1,500 persons, including 1,100 teachers. While engaged in something less tangible than sending a man to the moon or building sophisticated electronic devices, we are involved with a very important process and product—each child in the city must have the best possible education. If our staff is properly trained to meet the needs of youngsters, regardless of race or socioeconomic status, the chances of providing top quality education will improve.

RCA was not asked to "take over" any part of the school system. Rather, we asked RCA for help in adapting successful business techniques to the educational system. Why RCA? Because this local industry, with some of its major operations located in Camden, has a stake

---

Charles Smerin, superintendent of schools, Camden, New Jersey, prepared this article, "Schools and Industry Can Be Partners," for *The School Administrator*. **It is the eleventh in a series of 12 essays on the general subject "Proposals for Progress: Promise and Performance."**

in the future of the city and its children. For more than 50 years young men and women, products of the Camden school system, have helped to make RCA the corporation it is today. With its strong tradition of staff development, RCA is able to contribute its expertise to help the schools.

There is still another important reason for involving a local business in Camden school concerns. RCA is capable of attracting highly skilled personnel to work on a relatively short-term basis. For its Camden educational project RCA assembled a team of 11 specialists representing managerial experience as well as enviable education credentials. Some came from within the corporate structure. Others, because of their qualifications, were recruited from industry or outside school districts. Nine of the professional staff members have earned master's degrees in fields ranging from open education and reading disabilities to human relations and communications. Several are Ph.D. candidates. School systems, encumbered by tenure regulations and limited recruiting procedures, are not able to pull together quickly a team with specialized qualifications. For RCA, however, which recruits on the national scene for a wide variety of positions, the task of forming an educational team was almost routine.

We seriously began to consider this cooperative type of venture after a team of state officials visited the district and issued a report delineating a number of major problem areas they believed were adversely affecting education in Camden. While the team recommended no general panacea, it appeared that the problems these officials described could be attacked through an intensive staff development program. Good staff training can bring about needed change in performance as well as in attitudes, which in turn pays off in benefits for the students.

Planning for CEDP began soon thereafter with representatives of RCA, the board of education and the state department of education. Through a succession of community meetings, the program won the approval of the city's lay educational leaders, who later formed the nucleus of CEDP's Community Advisory Council (CAC). Now more than one hundred members strong, the CAC continues to contribute support to the program and its activities.

Negotiations with state and federal officials resulted in a contract calling for RCA to analyze the training needs of the school system through evaluation and research, to write performance objectives for staff development programs, to assist the board in the procurement of instructors from colleges or training institutions and to provide administrative support for programs implemented by the board.

Fortunately, with the assistance of Don Davies of the U.S. Office of Education, federal monies were obtained to fund the project for the first year. There was no initial expense to the Camden Board of Education.

The federal funding came from a variety of sources. The Career Opportunities Program (Education and Professions Development Act—"D") granted $500,000 for the venture; $360,000 came from Title I (Elementary and Secondary Education Act); $60,000 from EPDA—"B-2"; $35,000 from Title III ESEA; and $15,000 from state funds. Because this project was the first of its kind, the funding agencies agreed to relax individual guidelines, giving RCA and CEDP the necessary freedom to meet the program objectives. RCA's allocation from the first-year grant was $285,000, for which the corporation was to provide 163.5 man months of effort, administrative and training facilities and other resources from within RCA that might be of help to the school system. The contract contained no performance or penalty clauses.

The board was interested primarily in accomplishing two general goals: (1) conducting a number of training programs for selected personnel, both professional and nonprofessional, during the tenure of the project, and (2) establishing within the system by the end of the project a staff development component responsible for continuing the training activities. This "turnkey clause" will ultimately determine the success or failure of the project.

In one sense, turnkey is built into the CEDP staffing structure. In addition to the RCA team, several school personnel, including the project director, are full-time CEDP staffers. CEDP also maintains close liaison with the state department of education and with the community by including their representatives as part of management. The state representative is a full-time, paid staff member. The community representative, by virtue of her office as president of the CAC, is a voluntary staff member.

CEDP's basic *modus operandi* is participatory decision making. As its very structure is a joint venture, CEDP's operating philosophy has always been to involve as many school and community interest groups as possible in all its activities. The underlying idea is that this type of involvement will ensure the success of individual programs and enhance turnkey success.

More and more political and industrial leaders are finding that policies made in a vacuum without the involvement and/or approval of all key interest groups result often in failure, sometimes in disaster. Education leaders are faced with a similar situation. Students, parents and teachers are all demanding more say in curriculum development, procedures, and decisions on broad educational goals and objectives for their systems.

The process for involving all segments of the school population in identifying training needs and planning programs is perhaps the corporation's most valuable and far-

reaching contribution to the Camden school system. In addition to structuring this process on paper, CEDP made it work.

CEDP conducted an extensive needs survey among representatives of 13 different school and community groups, including the teachers organization. The survey consisted of two phases. First, the groups were polled individually. When the results were tabulated and consolidated, representatives of these same groups assembled at one of the schools to participate in a simulation called "Advocacy." Advocacy was so structured that all had an opportunity to voice opinions and concerns and to rank the priority of needs submitted in the initial poll. More than 100 community and school persons "played" Advocacy that evening, demonstrating for the first time in this city that educators and parents could cooperatively set priorities. Together they identified 32 needs out of which came the majority of training programs conducted during the past two years.

Participatory decision making for CEDP, however, does not end with setting priorities, but extends into the very planning of the training programs designed to meet those needs. For each adopted need, CEDP formed a mini–task force consisting of representatives of CEDP, the school administration, the Camden Education Association, the state department of education and the community. Each task force met approximately three times to plan the objectives for the program, prepare a proposal and select a contractor to conduct the training. (All training is done on a subcontract basis by colleges, universities or private institutions selected on the basis of their ability to meet the program requirements.)

To date more than 1,000 board employees have participated in some aspect of the program that emerged from the initial needs survey. High on the priority list were programs to train community representatives to become a more productive force within the school system, training for teachers to work with disruptive children, training for members of the board of education, and training for bilingual teachers. These programs are either in progress or on the drawing boards. In addition, programs have been conducted for paraprofessionals, administrators, law enforcement officers, clerks and lunch aides, to name a few.

Equally important in the project is the systems approach, an idea that is gaining wide support among educational administrators. Until CEDP, however, we in Camden hadn't attempted to incorporate systems management into the school system.

Basically, the CEDP planning technology consists of six steps: needs analysis; research (cost effectiveness); management design; planning of instructional objectives based on needs (mini–task forces); evaluation; and dissemination.

It is not within the scope of this article to describe all the training programs CEDP has sponsored for school personnel. Some programs, however, especially those that have effected immediate change at the classroom level, are worthy of mention.

As a consequence of the CEDP program, the Camden Board of Education now employs approximately 70 paraprofessionals, all of whom are community people working full-time in classrooms while earning their degrees in education. Because their salaries come from Title I funding, all paraprofessionals are assigned to Title I projects—the bilingual program, open classrooms, nongraded classes or multimedia centers.

CEDP has designed a four-year program for paraprofessionals that coordinates their work experiences with their studies. Fifteen of them, who began the program in June 1970 with no college credits, recently were graduated from Camden County College with associate of arts degrees. In another two years they will have earned their bachelor's degrees in education from Glassboro State College. Although the board has not promised employment upon certification, four years of experience working with Camden children and living in Camden neighborhoods should give them an edge over other applicants.

Title I evaluations have shown that paraprofessionals and aides in the classrooms have a positive effect on student achievement, but it would be a mistake to measure the impact of paraprofessionals by academic test scores alone. Many of our children, for example, live on the same street as their paraprofessional or at least in the same neighborhood, strengthening the bond between the home and the classroom.

Some paraprofessionals are involved in CEDP's open classroom project called "Differentiated Staffing." Based on a combination of the open classroom and team teaching concepts, the Camden model of differentiated staffing is basically a more individualized program of educating children than the traditional approach with one teacher and 25 students in a self-contained classroom. In a D/S class, a team of three teachers and four paraprofessionals works with 100 students in an open space classroom and resource center. The new adult/student ratio is approximately 1:14, which provides increased individualized instruction for the youngsters.

Some advantages are obvious. The absence of one teacher or paraprofessional does not affect the day-to-day program for the student. Too, we avoid the necessity for substitutes. The teachers also derive a number of benefits. The staff is differentiated according to experience and ability. Teachers can concentrate on their strongest competencies and preferences. In addition, the teachers are released from many of the administrative tasks that detract from their teaching time. An important incentive for teachers is the

upward mobility built into the D/S pattern. Instead of promotion out of the classroom, D/S teachers can advance on a career ladder to the position of team leaders. Perhaps the most attractive feature of the D/S setup, however, is its flexibility. No classes are exactly the same, even with identical curriculum divisions and pupil groupings. Each class is structured to best meet the individual needs of its students.

We are in the second year of the D/S program. From three classes set up in the first year, we have expanded the number to nine, located in seven different schools. Included are five first grades, two second grades and one seventh grade. We plan to continue to expand gradually, depending on the willingness of principals and teachers to participate, within the limitations of facilities. In at least some of the classes, there has been measured improvement in the students' academic progress. Many of them consistently score higher in reading than similar students in traditional classes. Tardiness and absenteeism have been reduced. Fewer children are labeled as discipline problems. There are indications that kids really like going to school. One child, for example, begged her mother to return her to school as soon as possible after her dental appointment. Nurses find it a pleasure to work with D/S children, who seem to be "more independent, more self-disciplined." These comments are not the exception.

Another program, possibly the most popular among teachers, allows them to earn college credit in the Hilda Taba Teaching Strategies. These are four basic teaching strategies designed to help youngsters learn to think. Last year 58 teachers participated, six of whom became second echelon "leaders." Now they are instructing other teachers. This year 130 teachers have enrolled in the course. In addition, 36 high school students were trained in teaching methods based on the Taba approach. These students eventually became the nucleus of our Youth Tutoring Youth program. The basic objective is to equip the older students with teaching strategies that will enable them to work with younger students who are having difficulties completing their grade requirements. Through such a program both the older and younger students can improve their skills. For participating in the program, Glassboro State College is offering the tutors two college credits. In addition, they receive two high school credits and $2.50 an hour for working with the youngsters.

The increasing number of Spanish-speaking students in Camden schools has necessitated additional bilingual classes. Certified bilingual teachers are at a premium. To staff our bilingual classes we have had to recruit teachers from Puerto Rico, some of whom need help with conversational English and classroom methodology. Last summer CEDP sponsored several courses for these teachers.

Most of the training has been for school employees, but CEDP has also sponsored a leadership training program for 27 community representatives. Key persons representing established PTA's and Advisory Councils, as well as Spanish-speaking and civic organizations from all sections of the city, participated in the program, which aimed to increase leadership skills and to strengthen bonds between homes and schools. The 10-session program won the enthusiastic support of all who participated and subsequently formed the basis of Model Cities training programs conducted elsewhere in the state.

In all, there have been some 40 programs, involving at least eight different institutions of higher learning and a number of consultant organizations.

Of course, there have been problems. Like any change agent, CEDP has encountered suspicion and fear from the established institutions. The participatory planning process helped to overcome much of the difficulty, but it was an uphill struggle. At all times, CEDP attempted to maintain an open communications policy with the community and the schools, describing and interpreting its activities through the printed word and graphic presentations. Experience, too, helped dissipate some of the fears. Many teachers, for example, who at one time were skeptical of paraprofessionalism, are now begging for aides. We as administrators had to learn the value of the systems approach, and the positive force that a strong informed community can be in bringing about change.

Funding has presented another problem. Because of reduced federal spending, the RCA contract will end as of this summer, and we have had to make a hasty and somewhat imperfect attempt at turnkey. At the present time, supervisors and administrators have joined the CEDP staff to learn the operations and procedures for program planning. In addition, each individual training program is being turnkeyed by CEDP staff members to assigned school personnel. Each program has been documented according to a master turnkey plan. Lastly, RCA has submitted to the board of education five alternatives for establishing, within the existing structure, a department of staff development. From these five the Board will choose one for further elaboration. When this becomes effective, turnkey will be complete and the most significant CEDP objective will have been accomplished.

The key word to remember is *cooperation*. In CEDP we wanted an industry to help without *taking over* parts of the system. We have taken advantage of corporate expertise to our mutual benefit and that of our children.

August 1972
number 12

The Revolution in Teacher Education

A revolution is shaking teacher education in America—not a gradual, comfortable, deliberate development, but drastic upheaval and sudden climatic change. Traditional teacher education programs are being abandoned, dismantled or—under pressure of current events and criticisms—just falling apart at the seams. As a result, totally new programs are being developed, new standards for teacher education are being applied and fundamentally different forms of teacher certification are being proposed or experimented with.

The school administrator may quite possibly observe this revolutionary phenomenon in teacher education without any particular sense of concern or involvement. The education of teachers has traditionally been the preserve of departments within universities and colleges; the public schools get into the act only during the few weeks that the prospective teacher spends in student teaching under the eye—sometimes jaundiced—of a "master" teacher in a local school district. Teacher education is really somebody's else's business, the administrator may feel; and besides, there are so many other revolutions taking place that the school administrator simply does not have time to participate in this one. But this is a strange revolution—one involving the schools even more than the colleges and universities. It is a revolution involving the purpose, the planning and the conduct of the entire system of educating teachers for the elementary and secondary schools—and administrators are going to be in the middle of it.

Indictment of Present Programs

All revolutions have positive purposes and goals, but they get their start by being directed against what now *is*—established institutions, current practices, accepted beliefs. The revolution in teacher education faults present programs for being bookish, sterile, irrelevant, for giving insufficient attention to new methodologies, new media and other material and new social problems. Most of all current teacher education programs are charged with being ineffective; they do not produce teachers who produce results. Persons engaged in teacher education may wince, whimper or cry foul, but they cannot very well deny the essential truth of many of these charges. Revolutionary changes in the education of teachers are urgently needed.

Revolutionary Changes Proposed

Competency Based. Competencies, not courses! This is the fundamental thesis of the revolutionaries in the education of teachers. What our schools need are teachers competent to perform certain functions that result in demonstrable and measurable learning, not teachers who have completed a prescribed set of college courses. The proposal is that we do away with the courses and develop the competencies. Since these competencies, by definition, are behaviors, certification (and recertification and employment and promotion and retention) of teachers must be based on demonstrated competencies, precisely stated and precisely measured in behavioral terms.

Field-Centered. Teacher education should be centered in the schools, not the colleges or the universities. Give students who propose to be teachers earlier, longer and more varied school-based experience.

Kenneth H. Hansen, professor of education, Washington State University, Pullman, prepared this article, "The Revolution in Teacher Education," for *The School Administrator*. It is the last in a series of twelve essays on the general subject, "Proposals for Progress: Promise and Performance."

Professionally Controlled. Teacher education should be controlled by the profession, not by the professors. The soundest evaluators of the performance of professionals are juries of their peers—only actual teachers know what teachers actually do.

Judged by Results. In an era when accountability (however defined or misdefined) has become the rallying cry for the improvement of education, only results count—not good manners and good intentions. Therefore, the only way to judge teachers is in terms of what they produce—and the only thing that teachers produce is learning in students.

Make It Mod. In the now generation in a now society, teacher education must be *with it*. The entire program must be consonant with contemporary trends. Freedom in its every dimension is a primary requisite. New value systems must be understood and respected. Individualistic behavior on the part of both teacher and student must be encouraged. The new demand is for more than just the old bromide of "individualized" instruction; it is for individualized behavior in the sense of doing one's "own thing," whatever that thing might be. Established institutions, values, practices and beliefs are bankrupt; hence, the establishment must be viewed with a combination of skepticism and scorn. Therefore, schools must embrace—if they need to exist at all—"alternative" modes of education to conform with the alternative life styles that are so praised.

If these revolutionary changes are accepted—as they have been in many proposals and some programs—then teacher education in the 70's will not look like anything we have ever known. It will be as different from what we are used to as teacher education of the 50's or 60's was from the normal schools of the late 18th and 19th centuries. Competencies will replace courses, the schoolrooms will replace college classrooms, professionals will replace professors as the determiners of the program, objectively measurable results will replace good intentions, and the entire teacher education program will support contemporary alternative life styles.

Dangers and Oversimplifications

These proposals, revolutionary or even radical as some of them may be, sound quite enticing to many schoolmen. For one thing, teachers are expensive; the stark reality is that—even in the most spartan budget—salaries eat up more than 80 percent of the available funds. What really hurts is that a good many of these expensive teachers aren't very effective; research studies and casual observations show quite conclusively that many students are not progressing as well as they could, or learning what they need in order to survive in a modern society. Valid certificates do not guarantee competency. Teacher educators, and the college or university classrooms over which they preside, are often remote from the real world and the pressing concerns of the contemporary schools. Teacher retention on the basis of tenure and promotion on the basis of longevity and college credits do not provide us better teachers or more effective education. Let's try something new.

Okay, let's. But before we completely dismiss the teacher education program we have known, or dismantle the colleges and schools of education, or enshrine a new set of principles or authorities, let's proceed with a bit of intelligent caution.

Revolutions, often born of honest disillusionment and nearly hopeless frustration, are almost always extreme, both in their analysis of current problems and their proposals for remedy. Self-proclaimed revolutionaries, too, are frequently arrogant and self-righteous. A quick review of the writings of the popular contemporary critics of education, and especially those who criticize teachers and teaching, makes it quite evident that the critics have all the answers. They are right, and everybody else is wrong. This tendency to extremism and arrogance suggests that we look at revolution and revolutionaries from a somewhat more detached and balanced point of view than those who propose radical changes are likely to offer.

The microview often obscures the macroview. Focusing in sharply on specific kinds of social problems and learning activities and teaching actions, many of those who propose revolutionary changes in the education of the teacher lose sight of the more generalized (and often more valid) goals they seek. For example, performance and process objectives used to measure teacher competency often are quite precise and wholly commendable. It is quite possible, however, that a teacher could work through any number of specific modules in a competency-based program, the completion of which is measured in precisely objective terms and according to a carefully specified formula, and *still* be unable to teach.

Possession by the teacher of a host of specific and verified competencies still does not guarantee overall competency — much less overall effectiveness.

The vehemence of many of the revolutionaries in teacher education leads to overreliance on gadgetry. When one has possession of *the* truth (the way, the truth and the light), it is very easy to see only one road to the attainment of that truth. Whether the specific training module or methodology relies largely on the mechanical gadgetry of CAI, the use of videotape or multimedia presentations, or the psychological gadgetry of consciousness raising and/or other group sensitivity and therapy sessions, the result is the same: preoccupation with the gadget replaces the desired broad teaching competency.

The valid assumption that much of teacher education has been grossly inadequate or even a hope-

less failure, when conducted through established channels and by established means, is flawed by the concurrent acceptance of a less valid assumption: that because those who are conducting education of teachers now do it badly, somebody or anybody else could automatically do it better. This is the problem that arises with the rather simple assumption that if we would just put teacher education into the hands of and under the control of practicing teachers, all would be well. Teachers, of all people, ought to understand the potential fallacy of this position, for educators have always complained that the general public felt that anybody and everybody was an expert on education. Perhaps not every teacher has valid credentials as a teacher educator.

Giving Direction to the Revolution

The revolution in teacher education is an inescapable reality, but its specific direction has not yet been established. If there is any one overriding principle that seems to emerge, it is this: that the education of teachers must, perhaps for the first time, be a really cooperative venture. It cannot remain solely with teacher educators; it cannot be turned over totally to teacher organizations; it is not the sole province of state education agencies; nor is it a matter only for administrative decision. Not just because it sounds comfortably democratic, but because teacher education does involve so many different groups concerned with education, the education of teachers and all of the personnel actions that affect teachers—certification and recertification, reward systems and the like—need to have the best possible thinking of all the groups concerned and involved.

What, then, can we learn from the revolution in teacher education? What direction can we give it? First of all, we must define the needed competencies for teachers precisely, but not narrowly. Precision of definition does not require the slavish acceptance of a series of discrete modules as the sole basis for determining teacher competence, nor does it give us the easy option of assuming that if we can list enough behavioral objectives and test thoroughly the degree to which they have been completed, we will have educated teachers adequately.

We must recognize differences in teaching styles as readily as we recognize differences in the learning styles of students. Not every teacher can profit equally from "going through" a series of modules embracing the various segments of teacher behavior that come under the general rubric of "competency." We need to provide multiple routes for teachers to achieve competency, routes that are consistent with their own personal beliefs, their own value systems, their own learning and teaching styles. Formulas based on modules and objectives will be no more effective than mere completion of standardized and stultifying teacher education courses, conscientiously graded and duly recorded by the registrar and accepted at face value by some certifying authority.

Perhaps the greatest advancement of the last decade in the theory and practice of curriculum development for children and youth has been the emphasis on the "discovery" approach, even though this has occasionally led into some rather fruitless bypaths of unplanned and inconsequential student activity. Basically, the contention is that the most effective way to learn anything permanently and personally is to experience it. This idea is not new, but we have been slow to apply it to teacher education. Possibly the most encouraging and useful outcome of the revolution in teacher education will be its insistence that if teachers are to teach competently and effectively they need to have early, continued and broad experience with children in classrooms so that they can discover for themselves how learning takes place and how they can assist the process. This means that much of teacher education *will* move out of the classroom into the schoolroom—and administrators will need to strain their budgets and spread their personnel even thinner than they do now to accommodate this shift.

Although I would maintain that competent teaching is something more than demonstrated mastery of a series of discrete skills, the revolution in teacher education seems to me to be on the right track in emphasizing that there *are* specific skills teachers need to meet specific demands in our educational and social systems. They do need to learn the intelligent and selective use of modern media; they need training and experience in accurately and precisely stating both performance and process objectives for themselves and their students; they need to learn the meaning of accountability at the classroom level—careful planning and programming and utter candor and extreme clarity in reporting to students and to parents both the successes and the failures of the educational program. Teachers must have concern, knowledge and respect for the world of work—the world in which all their students must, if they are successfully educated, ultimately find their places. They need to be oriented to the necessity for, and the processes of, change, if they and their students are to avoid the shock of the future. Above all, teachers need to learn specific differentiated tasks if they are to fit into a differentiated staffing pattern, rather than just knowing how to be general-purpose, all-around teacher.

The revolutionaries in teacher education are right when they urge us to focus on specific objectives, provided these objectives are seen as part of broader educational purposes. For we must restore to teacher education a sense of real purpose—not the strained, purse-lipped, joyless "dedication" which we have ascribed to teachers to justify underpaying and overwork-

ing them, but a sense of the purpose and importance of education for every individual in our society. This calls for a continuing examination, in teacher preparation programs, of philosophical principles and social values that embrace much more than just simple technical competency on the part of the teacher.

At the same time that we encourage the development of a sense of purpose in teachers, we need to impart a sense of the wholeness of the educational process. Critics of contemporary teacher education commonly deprecate the traditional practice of grounding teacher education in the framework of a liberal arts program, maintaining correctly that much of what goes by the name of "liberal arts" is far from liberating. But the best of the arts *do* liberate; they give man freedom from ignorance, parochialism and prejudice. Today as always, an understanding of man and his society—its history, accomplishments and aspirations—forms the most solid matrix into which to imbed a teacher education program.

We need to reaffirm the importance of authority in education. The revolutionaries appear to be opposed to authority, telling us that the days of *in loco parentis* are over, that authority is suspect everywhere and especially in the classroom. Goodbye, Mr. Chips—thank God! But perhaps even the revolutionaries would agree that unless the teacher speaks with the authority that stems from being an authority, not from holding a position of authority, his teaching cannot be considered competent.

To build an essential and functional sense of freedom in students, as Dewey said a half century ago, the teacher needs to exert *more* authority, not *less*. But it must be the authority of a teacher who knows what is expected of him because the required teaching competencies have been clearly defined, who knows what he is teaching because he has mastered it, who teaches with authority not because authority has been bestowed upon him but because there is implicit in his actions an authority born of respect for reason, for knowledge, for understanding and, above all, for those he teaches. So if the revolution in teacher education does help teachers become more competent and authoritative—but not authoritarian—then the revolutionaries too could support the restoration of authority to teaching.

Administrative Tasks

I said at the outset that administrators can take no comfort in assuming that somebody else is going to manage the revolution in teacher education. Not only must administrators take their part in the various kinds of formal consultation involved in the collaborative approach to teacher education and teacher certification, but they also face some special administrative tasks that only they can do.

If we are to have competency-based teacher education, those competencies must be defined at several levels and in several ways. The administrator's special task is to assure the availability of precise position descriptions for each teaching post. Simply to say that the teacher is to "teach fourth grade" or to "teach social studies" certainly does not provide the basis for determining the list of specific competencies appropriate either to a teacher education program or to a program of teacher certification.

Competency-based teacher education and teacher certification rely both on initial task descriptions that are understandable and accurate and on evaluation of how well these tasks have been performed. Again, with a growing but still unsatisfying number of exceptions, most evaluation of teachers can best be described as sloppy. The evaluation forms used are imprecise; their application is haphazard; and their interpretation is largely subjective. Evaluation of teachers may never become a totally exact science, but it can be made markedly more precise by the use of a wider range of evaluative techniques and more frequent and consistent application of objective judgments.

If we as schoolmen believe that the revolutionaries are correct when they say that teacher education should be centered in the field, focused on the schoolroom rather than on the college classroom, then it will become necessary to provide multiple opportunities for education students to get early experiences in a variety of kinds of tasks associated with teaching—working as teacher aides and as assistants in special areas of the teacher's tasks, with much longer periods of formal apprenticeship and probationary service. These are opportunities that no college or university can provide.

If we are to judge the competency of teachers largely in terms of their performance as measured by student learning, then the schools themselves must improve and expand upon evaluative processes that can tell us how well the students are doing. Unless we evaluate student learning more accurately, it will be impossible to evaluate the competency of teacher performance on any rational basis.

Finally, if we accept and want to accelerate the revolution that is taking place in teacher education, it would be most unfortunate if those teachers who had undergone and successfully completed a revitalized teacher education program had to look forward to going out into a school climate that still prized the old virtures of uniformity, conformity and routinized rote memory learning.

The bright promises of the revolution in teacher education will be dimmed, and its potential impact blunted, unless teachers who emerge from this revolutionized program can find schools and classrooms with a climate favorable to the kind of teaching for which their newfound competencies were designed. The promise of the revolution is great, but its performance can be validated only in the classrooms of America.

END

DEPT. OF HEW

NAT'L INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

ERIC

DATE FILMED

DEC 20 75